EXHIBIT 5

THOMAS J. FALLON	
DATE: FEBRUARY 12, 2007 BEFORE: Hon. Patrick L. Willicircuit Court Judge APPEARANCES: KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecute On behalf of the	Case No. 05 CF 381
DEFENDANT. DATE: FEBRUARY 12, 2007 BEFORE: Hon. Patrick L. Willicircuit Court Judge APPEARANCES: KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecute On behalf of the	or
DATE: FEBRUARY 12, 2007 BEFORE: Hon. Patrick L. Willich Circuit Court Judge APPEARANCES: KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecute On behalf of the THOMAS J. FALLON	or
BEFORE: Hon. Patrick L. Willi Circuit Court Judge APPEARANCES: KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecute On behalf of the THOMAS J. FALLON	or
Circuit Court Judge APPEARANCES: KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecute On behalf of the THOMAS J. FALLON	or
Special Prosecute On behalf of the THOMAS J. FALLON	or
THOMAS J. FALLON	State of Wisconsin,
Special Prosecuto	
	State of Wisconsin.
NORMAN A. GAHN	
Special Prosecuto	or State of Wisconsin.
	Scace of wisconsin.
DEAN A. STRANG Attorney at Law	
On behalf of the	Defendant.
JEROME F. BUTING	
Attorney at Law On behalf of the	Defendant
	Detellualit.
STEVEN A. AVERY Defendant	
Appeared in perso	on.
TRANSCRIPT OF PR	ROCEEDINGS
Reported by Diane T	esheneck, RPR
Official Court	Reporter

			D	AGE
	ana Makeratan Inda		-	
OPENING INS	TRUCTIONS BY	THE COURT	19	9
OPENING STA	TEMENTS			
ATTORNEY KR	ATZ		31	7
ATTORNEY ST	RANG		13	LO
WITNESSES				
MICHAEL D.	HALBACH			
Direct Examination by ATTORNEY KRATZ			15	56
Cross-Examination by ATTORNEY STRANG		17	78	
THOMAS PEAR	CE			
Direct Examination by ATTORNEY KRATZ		19	0	
Cross-Examination by ATTORNEY STRANG		20	2	
Redirect Examination by ATTORNEY KRATZ		20	9	
DAVID BEACH				
Direct Exam	ination by AT	TORNEY KRATZ	21	1
Cross-Exami	nation by ATT	CORNEY STRANG	21	.5
EXHIBITS	MARKED	OFFERED	ADMITTED	
L &2		178	178	
3 & 4 5,6,7	162	178 178	178 178	
3	168	178	178	
i>	169	178	178	
0		178	178	
		2		

THE COURT: At this time the Court calls

State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery, Case No. 05 CF

381. Will the parties state their appearances for the record, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Good morning, Judge. The State of Wisconsin appears by Calumet County District Attorney Ken Kratz, lead counsel and appearing as special prosecutor in this case.

Appearing with me include Tom Fallon, an Assistant Attorney General from the Department of Justice and Norm Gahn, an Assistant District Attorney, from Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, also appearing as special prosecutor.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And good morning. Steven
Avery appears in person. He's represented by Jerome
Buting, immediately to my left, and I am Dean
Strang.

THE COURT: All right. We're here this morning, before we bring the jurors out, first of all, to discuss any comments the parties have on the opening instructions that have been provided by the Court. Before we get to that, are there any other issues that either party feels should be addressed before the jurors are brought in?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The one logistical issue I

had was during the opening statements and the closing arguments the Clerk, Ms Bonin, has a switch near her which is called public seating or something of that nature. I'm going to ask that that switch, and I got the approval of the sheriff for that -Ouite frankly, Judge, with PowerPoint or

Quite frankly, Judge, with PowerPoint or other presentations in this area, the gallery and other spectators find it much easier to see those without that one bank of lights, the public seating lights. If Ms Bonin would like to try that at this point so the Court can see, I would appreciate that.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

indicated he had no objection. It just provides less glare and an opportunity for those in the public to observe what it is that we're talking about. Again, I suggest that just for openings and closings.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection?
ATTORNEY STRANG: There is not.

THE COURT: Anything else to take up before we address the opening instructions?

ATTORNEY STRANG: My thought is that we might take Mr. Avery's personal statement on

waiving -- or not waiving, but stipulating to the second element of Count 3 of the second Amended Information.

THE COURT: Very well. For the record, I will note the Court has previously been informed that the defendant intended to stipulate to the second element of the possession of a firearm charge; that is, the defendant's status as having been convicted of a felony before November 5 of 2005.

Before I notify the jury that the defendant is making that stipulation, the Court has to make sure that the defendant is doing so knowingly and voluntarily. So, Mr. Avery, I'm going to be addressing these questions to you.

Before the Court accepts your stipulation to one of the elements of the felon in possession of a firearm charge, I'm going to be asking you a few questions. If you have any trouble understanding any question that I ask, let me know and I will let you speak with your attorneys.

Mr. Avery, do you understand that you have the right to a jury trial in this case and that includes the right to require the State to

prove every element of each offense charged, 1 beyond a reasonable doubt, to all members of the 2 jury? Do you understand that? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 4 THE COURT: You understand that in the case 5 of the felon in possession of a firearm charge, this 6 means that you can, if you wish, require the State 7 to prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that you were 8 convicted of a felony before November 5 of 2005? Do 9 you understand that? 10 Yes, I do. THE DEFENDANT: 11 THE COURT: Do you further understand that, 12 if you wish, you can stipulate; that is, you can 13 agree that you were convicted of a felony before 14 November 5 of 2005 and make further evidence on that 15 issue irrelevant; do you understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 17 THE COURT: Do you wish to waive your right 18 to a jury trial on that element; that is, agree that 19 you were convicted of a felony before November 5 of 20 2005? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 22 THE COURT: Have you had adequate 23 opportunity to discuss your decision with your 24 attorneys? 25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 1 THE COURT: And have your attorneys 2 explained to you your right to a jury trial on this 3 element? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises or 6 threats to you to give up your right to a jury trial 7 on this element of the firearms charge? 8 THE DEFENDANT: No. 9 THE COURT: Do you understand each of the 10 questions that I have asked you and what your 11 attorneys have told you about this matter? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Strang, have you had 14 adequate opportunity to discuss this matter with 15 your client? 16 ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes. 17 THE COURT: And do you believe that 18 Mr. Avery is knowingly and voluntarily giving up his 19 right to a jury trial on this particular element of 20 the possession of a firearm charge? 21 ATTORNEY STRANG: On that element, yes, I 22 do. 23 THE COURT: Very well, the Court does find 24 that the defendant has knowingly and voluntarily 25

waived his right to a jury trial on the second element of the felon in possession of a firearm charge and the Court will accept the defendant's stipulation on that element.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: For the record, Judge, the State also acquiesces and accepts the stipulation.

THE COURT: Thank you. As I indicated previously, I have provided the parties with a copy of the Court's proposed opening instructions. And it's the Court's understanding that those proposed instructions are acceptable to each of the parties with the exception of some language involving the elements of the crime on the two counts that are charged as a party to the crime. First, counsel, am I correct in that understanding?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, Judge. Although the State, as Mr. Gahn and Mr. Fallon and I have spoken, and after our brief conversation in chambers, we are asking the Court adopt a very similar series of language that the Court has proposed in its last submission. I will be happy to put our ideas on the record, but you are correct, Judge, there is one change that we're requesting.

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Strang.
ATTORNEY STRANG: We were satisfied with

the whole of the Court's final proposed instructions to be given preliminarily and we object to the modification that the State has offered.

THE COURT: All right. I will hear from the State first, then, on the proposed modification.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. The substantive change that we are asking is that towards the bottom of page six of the preliminary instructions, when the Court reads the element of the offense for first degree intentional homicide, as a party to the crime, the Court submit the following language:

That Steven Avery caused the death of Teresa Halbach or aided and abetted Brendan Dassey in causing the death of Teresa Halbach.

As we have indicated throughout the jury selection process and, in fact, in motions before trial, whether Mr. Dassey testifies in this case at all or whether Brendan Dassey is to be referred to at all in this trial is still very much at issue.

To highlight or alert the jury that

Brendan Dassey is the individual from which

Mr. Avery acted in concert, we believe to be

inappropriate and would, as some of the jurors

quite candidly indicated in jury selection,
suggest that the State should, for whatever
reason, be calling Mr. Dassey as a witness, not
withstanding his Fifth Amendment rights not to do
so, or against self-incrimination.

We're, therefore, Judge, asking that the elements read that Steven Avery caused the death of Teresa Halbach or aided and abetted another in causing the death of Teresa Halbach. Similar language would be inserted into the second element, again, removing the words Brendan Dassey and inserting the words another.

That provides no prejudice to the defense. It is an accurate statement of the law and, again, removes the suggestion that the State in some way has a burden, or obligation, or even practically speaking should call Mr. Dassey or insert Mr. Dassey into this case.

Lastly, Judge, if the Court adopts that change, then the statement or comment as to unanimous agreement not being required, further up on the page, on page No. 6, is in fact appropriate, is required, and we would ask -- I think that's joined by Mr. Strang -- that that instruction be reinserted and added in the

1 preliminary instructions. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Strang? Well, just --3 before I get to Mr. Strang, Mr. Kratz, what is the 4 language, I'm looking at page 6, element one, what 5 language exactly is the State proposing? 6 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Just instead of the name 7 Brendan Dassey, you are just exchanging that with 8 the word another. 9 THE COURT: Just a second. 10 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Aided and abetted another 11 in the commission of the crime. I think that's a 12 correct statement of the law and as I mentioned, 13 Judge, removes the suggestion that the State have an 14 obligation to set forth its theory of the 15 prosecution when it may very well be that Mr. Dassey 16 not testify in this case. 17 THE COURT: So, you are proposing to read 18 Steven Avery caused the death of Teresa Halbach or 19 aided and abetted another in causing the death? 20 ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's right. 21 THE COURT: And with respect to the other 22 references to Mr. Dassey in this count and the other 23 count, you are proposing that in each case it be 24 replaced with another.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

March 2, 2006, the State had thought it as inappropriate to pair Brendan Dassey and Steven Avery in the commission of these crimes as it thinks it today. And the 11 months of prejudicial publicity that we have had, perhaps we would have been spared, if the State thought then that it was inappropriate to link these two together as co-actors, accomplices in the death of Teresa Halbach.

Today is too late to do that. To now insert the ambiguous term "another", which potentially includes the whole world, is to invite the very speculation about who an accomplice may have been or who a third party culprit may have been, that the State successfully opposed when we made a fairly elaborate proffer on possible third party actors.

Up through that motion, it was the State's position that Brendan Dassey, and Brendan Dassey only, was the possible third party or accomplice in this crime. And now, on no showing at all of the potential culpability of another, the State proposes to throw open the field of

possible accomplice liability to the entire world.

That's not fair. It's not consistent with the positions the State has taken to date and it leaves Mr. Avery, on the one hand, unable to suggest directly the liability of a third person; and yet, on the other hand, defending a potentially shifting or unstated theory on who his accomplice or accessory may have been.

The State's choices on this case and on the history of it before seem to me pretty clear. Either stick with Brendan Dassey as the man you think is the accomplice and prove it, or drop the party to a crime allegation in Count 1 and Count 2 altogether and prove that Steven Avery committed this crime without allowing him to run the risk of accessory as a liability to a phantom.

Those seem to me the two legitimate choices. That's why we accepted and agreed with and thought accurate the Court's final draft of the preliminary jury instructions. We equally would accept a redraft that struck the party to a crime theory altogether, but that's the State's choice to make.

It's allowed to decide on what theory of liability it will proceed. It is not allowed on the morning of opening statements to back away from the man it has roped to Steven Avery for 11 months and say, could have been anybody. Just another. Just not fair.

And I would ask the Court to leave the instructions as they are, unless the State wishes to drop the party to the crime theory of liability in which case the instructions would be confined to Steven Avery alone.

As to unanimous agreement, I don't know that I have talked with the State about this at all and, in fact, I don't think that unanimous agreement requirement should be added back. The Court had struck it; it should remain stricken.

And the reason is really very straight forward.

Understanding that there is Wisconsin law to the contrary, my view of the due process requirement in the 14th Amendment and the right to a unanimous verdict that it embraces is that the jury, all 12, must be unanimous on whether the defendant is the principal, the defendant directly committed the crime, or whether he was an accessory, that is, an aider and abettor.

Now, I agree, for purposes of discussion in the abstract, that which of two means of aiding and abetting that Wisconsin law recognizes, those, let's assume for the sake of argument, jurors need not agree on unanimously.

Once they have decided unanimously, that it is as a party to the crime rather than as the principal that the defendant has been proven guilty.

But this instruction allows jurors to differ and to return a verdict that is not unanimous on the fundamental question of whether one is a principal, or liable as an accessory, an aider abettor, or a party to the crime.

Unanimity instruction, therefore, ought not be given at all at this point. By final instructions, I'm confident that the parties and the Court, in the end, can draft an instruction that treats unanimity properly.

THE COURT: All right. There appear to be two points that separate the parties. And I'm going to rule as follows: First of all, before I indicate the Court's decision, I think it's important to note that what we're talking about here are not the closing instructions that the jury is going to get when it's time to deliberate on the verdict, but

rather opening instructions, the purpose of which is simply to make it easier for the jurors to follow the evidence and understand what it is the State has to prove in order to justify a guilty verdict.

With that thought in mind, I think it's best to steer clear of controverted issues that may be clarified as the evidence comes in. The instructions the Court gives in the opening are not necessarily the instructions that will be given in the closing. It's easier to be more specific at that time once the Court knows what the evidence is.

For those reasons, I'm going to -Actually, I previously changed the elements of
the crime language on the two party to the crime
charges based on a format submitted by the
defense. I'm going to continue to use the
defense format, but I will substitute another for
Brendan Dassey.

I agree that it's not a good idea at the start of the trial to focus attention on Mr. Dassey; although, I understand that's the basis of the State's party to the crime theory. When the closing instructions are given, depending on how the evidence comes in, the

request being made by the defense may well be appropriate. But for purposes of the opening instructions, which are simply to outline the elements that the State must prove, I don't think that level of specificity is required.

With respect to the unanimity language, as I indicated to the parties in prior correspondence, while the comment to the party to the crime instruction would suggest that the unanimity requirement is appropriate, the Court has not had a chance to fully address the defense arguments and there are arguments to the contrary that I believe must be addressed before the Court is in a position to make a final decision.

It's not necessary during the opening instructions to tell the jury whether or not they have to be unanimous. The instructions are intended to help them follow the evidence.

Therefore, I am not going to include the unanimity language in the opening instructions.

I did previously reword the opening language to the substantive instructions to notify the jurors that the Court is going to be reading portions of the specific jury instructions. So certainly the possibility is

1 left open that the unanimity language can be inserted in the closing instructions. 2 3 I believe that addresses the parties comments with respect to the opening 4 instructions. Is there anything else either 5 party feels should be addressed before we bring 6 in the jurors and swear the jury? 7 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, one housekeeping 8 matter, I don't know if you have reminded the jurors 9 or perhaps -- excuse me -- the public as they were 10 brought in, but without an interest in having a Mike 11 Sherman moment, perhaps all cell phones should be 12 turned off. I don't know if that was something --13 THE COURT: Actually, the Court has ordered 14 that no cell phones be permitted in the courtroom 15 and I trust that the folks guarding the entrance to 16 the door have enforced that requirement. 17 ATTORNEY KRATZ: And the attorneys as well, 18 Judge, at least the State has taken care of that and 19 that's the only other comment we have. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Anything else from the defense? 21 ATTORNEY STRANG: Nothing here, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: If not, we can have the jury 23 brought in. 24

(Jury panel present.)

THE COURT: Good morning, jurors, you can be seated for a brief period of time. The Court has already called this morning the case of State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery, Case No. 05 CF 381. In a minute I'm going to read to you some opening instructions in this case, but before we do that, the Clerk will swear you in. So at this time I will ask you to all please rise.

THE CLERK: If you all would raise your right hand.

(Jury panel sworn.)

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, before the trial begins, there are certain instructions you should have to better understand your functions as a juror and how you should conduct yourself during the trial. Your duty is to decide the case based only on the evidence presented and the law given to you by the Court.

Do not let any personal feelings of bias or prejudice about such things as race, religion, national origin, sex, or age affect your deliberations.

Do not begin your deliberations and discussion of the case until all the evidence is

presented and I have instructed you on the law.

Do not discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else until your final deliberations in the jury room.

We'll stop or recess from time to time during the trial. You may be excused from the courtroom when it is necessary for me to hear legal arguments from the lawyers.

If you come into contact with any of the parties, lawyers or witnesses, do not speak with them. For their part, the parties, lawyers and witnesses will not contact or speak with the jurors.

As the Court has previously informed you, the jury will not be sequestered during this trial. That decision is dependent on the jurors not listening to, watching, or reading any news accounts of the case during the trial, nor discussing it with anyone, including members of your family, or other jurors.

For these reasons it is vital that you do not listen to any conversation about the case. Do not read any newspaper or internet reports or listen to any news reports on radio or television about this trial.

To assure that you are not exposed to improper media coverage, the Court is ordering that, for the duration of the trial, you do not watch the local news on television; do not listen to the local news on the radio; and do not read the newspaper, unless you first have someone remove any articles about this case.

In addition, do not visit any internet websites or web logs which may include any information about the case. Should you be exposed to any reports or communications from any source concerning the case during the trial, you should report that information to the jury bailiff.

Do not investigate this case on your own or visit the scene. Do not engage in any experimentation or research relating to any issues, facts, or persons involved in the case.

Do not consult dictionaries, computers, websites, or other reference materials for any additional information.

The Court is aware that many of you have been exposed to publicity concerning this case before you were selected to serve as a juror.

Each of you has committed to base your verdict

only on the evidence introduced during the trial.

It is of vital importance to the parties and to
the sanctity of the court process that you remain
true to this commitment.

Anything you may see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence that is offered and received at trial.

Evidence is defined as, first, the sworn testimony of witnesses both on direct and cross-examination, regardless of who called the witness.

Second, the exhibits the Court has received.

And, third, any facts to which the lawyers have agreed or stipulated or which the Court has directed you to find.

Attorneys for each side have the right and the duty to object to what they consider are improper questions asked of witnesses and to the admission of other evidence which they believe is not properly admissible. You should not draw any conclusions from the fact an objection was made. By allowing testimony or other evidence to be received over the objection of counsel, the Court

is not indicating any opinion about the evidence.

You jurors are the judges of the credibility of
the witnesses and the weight of the evidence.

You are not required to, but you may take notes during this trial except during the opening statements and the closing arguments.

The Court will provide you with materials for this purpose. In taking notes, you must be careful that it does not distract you from carefully listening to and observing the witnesses.

You may rely on your notes to refresh
your memory during your deliberations, otherwise
keep them confidential. Your notes will be
collected by the jury bailiff after each day's
session and kept in a secure place until the next
day of trial. After the trial, the notes will be
collected and destroyed.

You will not have a copy of the written transcript of the trial testimony available for use during your deliberations. You may ask to have specific portions of the testimony read to you. You should pay careful attention to all the testimony because you must rely primarily on your memory of the evidence and the testimony

1 introduced during the trial. It is the duty of the jury to scrutinize 2 and to weigh the testimony of witnesses and 3 determine the effect of the evidence as a whole. 4 You are the sole judges of the credibility; that 5 6 is, the believability of the witnesses and of the weight to be given to their testimony. 7 In determining the credibility of each 8 witness and the weight you give to the testimony 9 of each witness, consider these factors: 10 Whether the witness has an interest or 11 lack of interest in the result of the trial. 12 The witness' conduct, appearance and 13 demeanor on the witness stand. 14 The clearness or lack of clearness of 15 the witness' recollections. 16 The opportunity the witness had for 17 observing and knowing the matters the witness 18 testified about. 19 The reasonableness of the witness' 20 testimony. 21 The apparent intelligence of the 22 witness. 23 Bias or prejudice, if any has been 24 25 shown.

Possible motives for falsifying testimony.

And all other factors -- excuse me -all other facts and circumstances during the
trial which tend either to support or to
discredit the testimony.

Then give to the testimony of each witness the weight you believe it should receive. There is no magic way for you to evaluate the testimony. Instead, you should use your common sense and experience. In everyday life you determine for yourselves the reliability of things people say to you; you should do the same thing here.

To assist you in evaluating the evidence, I will now read to you portions of the specific jury instructions for the offenses with which the defendant is charged. I will read them to you in their entirety at the close of the evidence.

Count 1 of the Information charges the defendant with first degree intentional homicide as a party to the crime. Section 939 of the Criminal Code of Wisconsin provides that whoever is concerned in the commission of a crime as a

party to that crime and may be convicted of that crime although that person did not directly commit it.

The State contends that the defendant was concerned in the commission of the crime of first degree intentional homicide by either directly committing it or by intentionally aiding and abetting the person who directly committed it.

If a person intentionally aids and abets the commission of a crime, then that person is guilty of the crime as well as the person who directly committed it. A person intentionally aids and abets the commission of a crime when, acting with acknowledge or belief that another person is committing or intends to commit a crime, he knowingly either assists the person who commits the crime or is ready and willing to assist and the person who commits the crime knows of the willingness to assist.

To intentionally aid and abet the crime of first degree intentional homicide, the defendant must know that another person is committing or intends to commit the crime of first degree intentional homicide and have the

purpose to assist in the commission of that crime.

Before you may find the defendant guilty of first degree intentional homicide as a party to the crime, the State must prove, by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant directly committed the crime or intentionally aided and abetted the commission of the crime.

First degree intentional homicide as defined in Section 940.01 of the Criminal Code of Wisconsin is committed by one who causes the death of another human being with intent to kill that person or another. Before you may find the defendant guilty of first degree intentional homicide, the State must prove, by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the following two elements were present:

One, Steven Avery caused the death of Teresa Halbach or aided and abetted another in causing the death of Teresa Halbach. Cause means that the defendant's act was a substantial factor in producing the death.

Two, Steven Avery acted with the intent to kill Teresa Halbach whether he did so directly

or aided and abetted another.

Intent to kill means that the defendant had the mental purpose to take the life of another human being or was aware that his conduct was practically certain to cause the death of another human being. While the law requires that the defendant acted with intent to kill, it does not require that the intent exists for any particular length of time before the act is committed.

The act need not be brooded over, considered, or reflected upon for a week, a day, an hour, or even for a minute. There need not be any appreciable time between the formation of the intent and the act. The intent to kill may be formed at any time before the act, including the instant before the act and must continue to exist at the time of the act.

You cannot look into a person's mind to find intent. Intent to kill must be found, if found at all, from the defendant's acts, words, and statements, if any, and from all the facts and circumstances in this case bearing upon intent.

Intent should not be confused with

motive. While proof of intent is necessary to a conviction, proof of motive is not. Motive refers to a person's reason for doing something.

While motive may be shown as a circumstance to aid in establishing the guilt of the defendant, the State is not required to prove motive on the part of a defendant in order to convict. Evidence of motive does not, by itself, establish guilt. You should give it the weight you believe it deserves, under all the circumstances.

If you are satisfied, beyond a reasonable doubt, at the conclusion of the trial, that the defendant directly committed both elements of first degree intentional homicide, you should find the defendant guilty. If you are not so satisfied, you must find the defendant not guilty.

Count 2 charges the defendant with mutilating a corpse, also as a party to the crime. The State contends that the defendant was concerned in the commission of the crime of mutilating a corpse by either directly committing it or by intentionally aiding and abetting the person who committed it.

Before you may find the defendant guilty of mutilating a corpse as a party to the crime, the State must prove, by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant committed the -- directly committed the crime of mutilating a corpse or intentionally aided and abetted the commission of that crime.

Mutilating a corpse as defined in

Section 940.11 (1) of the Criminal Code of

Wisconsin is violated by one who mutilates a

corpse with intent to conceal a crime or avoid

apprehension, prosecution, or conviction for a

crime. Before you may find the defendant guilty

of this offense, the State must prove, by

evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable

doubt, that the following two elements were

present:

One, Steven Avery mutilated the corpse of Teresa Halbach or aided and betted another in mutilating the corpse of Teresa Halbach.

Two, in mutilating the corpse of Teresa Halbach or in aiding and abetting another in mutilating her corpse, Steven Avery acted with the intent to conceal a crime. This requires that the defendant acted with the purpose to

1 conceal a crime.

If you are satisfied, beyond a reasonable doubt, at the conclusion of the trial, that Steven Avery directly committed both elements of this offense, you should find the defendant guilty. If you are not so satisfied, you must find the defendant not guilty.

Count 3 charges the defendant with felon in possession of a firearm. Section 941.29 of the Criminal Code of Wisconsin is violated by a person who possesses a firearm, if that person has been convicted of a felony.

Before you may find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must prove, by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the following two elements were present:

One, the defendant possessed a firearm.

Firearm means a weapon which acts by the force of gunpowder. It is not necessary that the firearm was loaded or capable of being fired.

Possess means that the defendant knowingly had actual physical control of a firearm. An item is in a person's possession if it is in an area over which the person has

control and the person intends to exercise control over the item.

Two, the second element, is that the defendant had been convicted of a felony before November 5, 2005. The parties in this case have agreed that Steven Avery was convicted of a felony before November 5, 2005 and you must accept this as conclusively proved.

If you are satisfied, beyond a reasonable doubt, at the conclusion of the trial, that both elements of this offense have been proved, you should find the defendant guilty. If you are not so satisfied, you must find the defendant not guilty.

The final count charges the defendant with false imprisonment. False imprisonment as defined in Section 940.30 of the Criminal Code of Wisconsin is committed by one who intentionally confines or restrains another without the person's consent and with knowledge that he has no lawful authority to do so.

Before you may find the defendant guilty of this offense the State must prove, by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the following five elements were present:

One, the defendant confined or 1 restrained Teresa Halbach during her lifetime. 2 Two, the defendant confined or 3 restrained Teresa Halbach intentionally. This 4 requires that the defendant have the mental 5 purpose to confine or restrain Teresa Halbach. 6 Three, Teresa Halbach was confined or 7 restrained without her consent. 8 Four, the defendant had no lawful 9 authority to confine or restrain Teresa Halbach. 10 Five, the defendant knew that Teresa 11 Halbach did not consent and knew that he did not 12 have lawful authority to confine or restrain 13 Teresa Halbach. 14 Although this requires genuine restraint 15 or confinement, it does not require that it be in 16 a jail or prison. If the defendant deprived 17 Teresa Halbach of freedom of movement or 18 compelled her to remain where she did not wish to 19 remain, then Teresa Halbach was confined or 20 restrained. 21 The use of physical force is not 22 required. One may be confined or restrained by 23 acts, or words, or both. 24

You cannot look into a person's mind to

find out intent or knowledge. Intent and knowledge must be found, if at all, from the defendant's acts, words, and statements, if any, and from all the facts and circumstances in this case bearing upon intent and knowledge.

If you are satisfied, beyond a reasonable doubt, at the conclusion of the trial, that all five elements of this offense have been proproved -- excuse me -- have been proved, you should find the defendant guilty. If you are not so satisfied, you must find the defendant not guilty.

In reaching your verdict examine the evidence with care and caution. Act with judgment, reason and prudence. Defendants are not required to prove their innocence, the law presumes that every person charged with the commission of an offense is innocent. This presumption requires a finding of not guilty, unless in your deliberations you find it is overcome by evidence which satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty.

The burden of establishing every fact necessary to constitute guilt is upon the State.

Before you can return a verdict of guilty, the

evidence must satisfy you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty. If you can reconcile the evidence, upon any reasonable hypothesis consistent with the defendant's innocence, you should do so and return a verdict of not guilty.

The term reasonable doubt means a doubt based upon reason and common sense. It is a doubt for which a reason can be given, arising from a fair and rational consideration of the evidence or lack of evidence. It means such a doubt as would cause a person of ordinary prudence to pause or hesitate when called upon to act in the most important affairs of life.

A reasonable doubt is not a doubt which is based on mere guesswork or speculation. A doubt which arises merely from sympathy or from fear to return a verdict of guilt is not a reasonable doubt.

A reasonable doubt is not a doubt such as may be used to escape the responsibility of a decision. While it is your duty to give the defendant the benefit of every reasonable doubt, you are not to search for doubt, you are to search for the truth.

As you know, although this is a

Manitowoc County case with a Manitowoc County
jury, the case is being tried at the Calumet
County Courthouse. You will learn that when
Steven Avery became a suspect in this case, the
Manitowoc County District Attorney turned control
of the case over to the Calumet County District
Attorney because Mr. Avery had a lawsuit pending
against Manitowoc County at the time.

For logistical reasons, the parties
jointly requested that the trial be held in
Calumet County and the Court granted that
request. You should draw no inference for or
against either party to this case because of the
location of the trial, or the fact that it is not
being prosecuted by the Manitowoc County District
Attorney.

In a few minutes the lawyers will make opening statements. The purpose of an opening statement is to give the lawyers an opportunity to tell you what they expect the evidence will show, so that you will better understand the evidence as it is introduced during the trial. I must caution you, however, that the opening statements are not evidence.

Afatement

At this time we're going to take a very short break so that the State may get its equipment ready to present the opening statement. We'll be back in just a few minutes.

(Jury not present.)

THE COURT: Five minutes, counsel.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine.

(Recess taken.)

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Members of the jury, at this time we're going to hear the opening statement from the State. Mr. Kratz, you may begin.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, Mr. Strang, Mr. Buting, Mr. Avery, good morning.

MR. AVERY: Good morning.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We're all a little nervous this morning. And I think that if we admit that, we, being the lawyers, and the jurors asked to decide this important matter, I think we're all going to be better off.

And on behalf of the State, let me first start by thanking you, thanking you for your jury service, thanking you for your attention that you

are about to give in this case, and thanking you in detail for what in jury selection we talked about may perhaps be the most important decision that you will ever make, at least for the rest of your lives.

You will note, and we have already introduced, that there are three attorneys on this case, myself, Ken Kratz, the Calumet County District Attorney. This is my courthouse. And I'm joined by Mr. Fallon who is seated directly to my right. Mr. Fallon is an Assistant Attorney General with the Department of Justice. And joining us also is Mr. Norm Gahn.

ATTORNEY GAHN: Good morning.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Mr. Gahn is an Assistant
District Attorney in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin.
You will learn that each of us are special
prosecutors in this case. But what's so special
about a special prosecutor? Why would some small
town lawyer from Chilton be in charge of this entire
prosecution, this big of a case? Why would Ken
Kratz be asked to lead up this prosecution?

We'll talk about how this case was assigned over, but just understand, at least for this person, that although we are all experienced

1 prosecutors, we're doing a favor for Manitowoc 2 County. It's a rather big favor for Manitowoc 3 County, but it's a favor nonetheless. It is 4 helping the Manitowoc County District Attorney's 5 Office in presenting this case. Mr. Rohrer, your District Attorney, asked me to take over the case early on. You will learn about when that happened. But it is still something that we were simply asked to and we did, in fact, perform. There's two investigators in this case. Now, you are going to hear that there were hundreds of law enforcement officers involved in this investigation, but these kinds of cases require direction. They require leadership by law enforcement officials that have experience.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first lead investigator in the case who is seated in the courtroom is Mark Wiegert.

MR. WIEGERT: Good morning.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Mr Wiegert is an investigator with the Calumet County Sheriff's Department.

The other lead investigator in this case is Tom Fassbender. Mr. Fassbender works for the Department of Justice. He works for a law

enforcement branch of the Department of Justice which is called the Division of Criminal Investigation.

And, again, knowing who we are, knowing who the five of us are, the prosecution team, we hope may help in determining what's important in these cases.

The Judge has told you, at least in brief terms, what an opening statement is. But often times evidence comes in in bits and pieces, especially in a six week trial. That isn't something that you will expect all of the evidence to come at you at once. And so if we can provide a road map or an overview of what the evidence is going to show, that should be helpful for you.

Some juries that I have spoken to, it's been helpful to describe this process as the provision of the cover of a jigsaw puzzle box.

All right. You think of evidence as pieces in a jigsaw puzzle. You wouldn't tell, if you were handed one piece of a jigsaw puzzle, where that's going to go. But if you got the box and if you have the box, some of the pieces are obvious where they go; some are not so obvious, but at

least it's a guide. It's a help for you as to where these pieces all fit.

Now, before I go any further, I want to talk to you about something that I know some of you, in your specific questions, expressed as some concern and that's the nature of the evidence that's going to be presented. This is a very, very serious crime and potentially has very, very graphic kinds of details that may be involved or may be presented.

But there is some uncertainty about how much evidence is going to be presented. And I wanted to assure you, as the lead prosecutor, as the person responsible for the presentation of the case a couple of things.

Number one, and perhaps most importantly for you, as the jury, I'm only going to present those pieces of evidence that are necessary; those pieces that are necessary to tell you the entire story. My job is not to present gruesome, or overly graphic information for you.

And I think as we go through this process, you are going to find that the evidence is pretty straight forward. It is not necessarily gruesome or graphic, isn't something

that you should fear at this early stage. All right.

I understand the sensitivities not only of you, but of most of the people seated on the left hand side of the courtroom. And I -- actually, I want you to look over to the left side of the courtroom. That's the Halbach family.

You are going to see them throughout the case, friends and family. And I want to assure you that before the first piece of evidence is ever introduced in this case, everyone of those people: The mother, the father, the brothers, the sisters, the friends, and any other family members that wanted to, have already seen all of this evidence. All right.

I sat down with them and as sensitively as I possibly could, allowed them an opportunity to review the evidence. That's just something that a prosecutor should do and that's all been done. So as you see photographs being presented, as you see physical evidence being brought into the courtroom; I want to assure you that the Halbach family already has seen it.

They have already known the kinds of

evidence that are going to be presented. And I think that that was necessary for you to hear and necessary for you to understand that this family does have that information.

The Judge has told you that there's four charges. I'm very, very briefly going to talk about those four, because I don't want to reiterate what the Judge did. But there are four separate charges that the defendant is charged with: First degree intentional homicide, mutilation of a corpse, felon in possession of a firearm and false imprisonment.

Now, the Judge instructed you and my job today in opening statement, again, this isn't evidence, but it is a help for you; it's the cover if you will; it's the road map; it's the overview, to talk about the first legal concept that you as a jury has to understand. And that's the concept called being a party to the crime.

The Judge has told you that that can be satisfied either if the defendant committed an offense himself or if the defendant aided and abetted another in the commission of the offense.

Now, the first two counts, the homicide and the mutilation of a corpse are charged as a party to

the crime.

And so you will learn, at the conclusion of the case, six weeks from now, if you fast forward six weeks from now, that the jury instructions will tell you that if the defendant committed any of those elements himself, or if the defendant aided in another -- another -- excuse me -- aided and abetted another in the commission of those offenses, that you can and should find him guilty.

Now, I can't stand up here and predict what the defense is going to bring into this case, what cross-examination they may encounter, or if they even choose to present any kind of defense, nor should I. That isn't my job.

My job, as the prosecutor, is to present our case, to present the physical evidence that we have developed, to present the witnesses that we have developed to prove our case. But just understand, and just remember this concept when it comes time to deciding whether or not the defendant is guilty.

The Judge also told you about something called elements of the offense. The State has the burden of proof here. The defense has

absolutely no burden. And our burden is to prove the case, beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Judge explained to you already that beyond a reasonable doubt means a doubt for which a reason can be given when considering all the evidence. Let me tell you what it is not, though. Beyond a reasonable doubt is not beyond all doubt. It's not 100 percent. And when we are dealing with a human justice system, you can't expect beyond all doubt, or beyond a shadow of a doubt, or comments sometimes that we have heard about that.

It's beyond a reasonable doubt. A doubt for which a reason can be given. And I'm standing before you, members of the jury, telling you that I accept that burden. I will prove this case, beyond a reasonable doubt. But we didn't want you going into this case expecting one hundred percent, or beyond all doubt, because there are human factors or dynamics that go into these cases.

Each charge, the Judge told you, has elements of those offense, we're going to go through those in just a minute. But, also, each of the four charges should be considered

separately. You shouldn't group them together and decide if he is guilty of all four or none. Each of the four counts are to be considered separately. And, in fact, there is separate evidence for all four of those counts.

And, finally, the defendant is presumed innocent. As Mr. Avery sits here today, because you have heard no evidence in this case, he is presumed by you, or should be presumed by you, to be innocent. However, and this is a big however, that presumption disappears at that very moment when the evidence in this case satisfies you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he is guilty of that offense. That presumption disappears at the moment that the evidence proves that he is guilty.

Count 1, the Judge instructed you, has two elements. And why I'm telling you this and why I'm showing them on the screen or on a PowerPoint presentation is because these are serious, serious crimes; in fact, the most serious crimes that we have in the State of Wisconsin.

The legal concepts aren't all that complex. We are talking about two things that we

have to prove, caused the death of somebody and did it intentionally. Nothing magic about that, nothing complex about that and all of you should be able to understand that.

The same thing with mutilation of a corpse, just the two elements; that he mutilated a corpse and that he did so to conceal a crime that had been committed. You will hear evidence in this case about what that crime was that he was trying to conceal. The crime, as you may have already guessed, is the first degree intentional homicide.

Mr. Avery is also charged with felon in possession of a firearm; again, two elements, the felon in possession. First, that he possessed the firearm, that seems obvious. And, number 2, that some time before November of 2005, he had been convicted of a felony.

Now, the Judge has told you that that second element is stipulated. Stipulation means that the facts are agreed to by the parties; that you can take that as already having been proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Avery has that felony conviction. And so it's just the first element of that offense that the State has

to prove. Do you all understand that? All right.

Now, false imprisonment has five separate elements to the offense. Those five elements are that he confined or restrained, note that that's in the disjunctive; he either confined or restrained Teresa Halbach, intentionally, without her consent. He didn't have authority and he knew that he didn't have authority to confine or restrain Ms Halbach.

All right. Enough of the civics lesson.

Let's talk about what the evidence is going to show. On Monday, October 31st, 2005, beginning at approximately 2:45 p.m., the State intends to prove to you that the defendant restrained, murdered, and mutilated a 25 year old photographer named Teresa Halbach.

We're going to prove to you what happened. We're going to prove to you who committed this crime. We're going to prove to you where it happened. We're going to prove to you when, specifically, it happened. And those will prove all of the elements of the offense.

What we're not going to prove to you, what the Judge has already told you we don't have

to and, in fact, can't prove to you, is why. We can't prove the why in a case like this. That's called motive, the reason behind the killing; what was in Mr. Avery's mind when he decided to kill this lovely young woman.

I'm going to introduce you to somebody.

This remarkable young woman was 25 years of age;
she was single; she was a freelance photographer.

She had her own photography business that was,
although in its infancy, was doing quite well.

This woman, and I will remind you several times in this opening and throughout the trial, I will remind you that we're talking about a real person. We're talking about somebody's daughter, somebody's sister, a lot of people's friend. Teresa Halbach had her whole life in front of her and the evidence is going to show that on Halloween of 2005, that all ended, that ended in the hands of the defendant, Steven Avery.

It's such a big case, with such a big job that we have to try to present all of this investigation. I'm going to start from the beginning and I'm going to start talking about the investigation itself.

Ms Halbach was reported missing on the third of November, 2005. Ms Halbach worked for a -- at least part of her photography business was that she worked for a publication called Auto Trader Magazine. You are going to learn through the case and you are going to hear from several witnesses from Auto Trader that it is a magazine that, basically, is responsible for selling automobiles, some other things, trailers and the like, but mostly automobiles. And it's a publication that Teresa supplemented her income with.

Teresa was mostly responsible or mostly enjoyed taking photographs of weddings and was already developing quite a niche and quite a specialty taking pictures of little kids, of babies and young children. But to supplement her young business, she worked for Auto Trader Magazine. So to understand how this case transforms from a missing person investigation into what became one of the largest criminal investigations in Wisconsin history, starting from the beginning, we're starting from the investigation, is important for you to understand.

The investigation determined that Teresa Halbach took three pictures or at least had three business stops on the 31st of October. Now, one of those were a person by the name of Mr. Schmitz; one of those was a person by the name of Mr. Zipperer. And the third and the last stop that she made late in the afternoon on the 31st was at the Steven Avery Salvage Property.

The investigation early on determined that this man, Steven Avery, called Auto Trader Magazine at 8:12 that morning, on that very day, on the 31st of October. And Mr. Avery asked, specifically, that the same woman who has been out here before, the same woman who on at least six and perhaps more occasions had come out to take pictures. Mr. Avery wanted her out there the afternoon of the 31st.

Now, two very critical findings very early on in this investigation came to light:

Number 1, that Steven Avery was the one who lured Ms Halbach out to the property on the 31st. But number 2, and perhaps as importantly, Steven Avery was the last person to see Teresa Halbach alive.

Who is this man? The Judge told you

that there was a lawsuit which was filed against
Manitowoc County and many of you, in fact,
virtually all of you, knew something about Steven
Avery before serving on this particular jury.
Mr. Avery achieved some degree of notoriety back
in 2003 when he was exonerated for a 1985 sexual
assault conviction.

You should know that that exoneration was based upon DNA evidence. You should know that that DNA evidence was performed by the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory and it was performed by an analyst, the head of the DNA unit in Madison, a woman by the name of Sherry Culhane. I want you to remember that name because you are going to hear that name later on in this case.

Mr. Avery, as you already heard, later filed a civil lawsuit against Manitowoc County seeking compensation, seeking money for the -- excuse me -- for the time that -- that he was wrongfully convicted. And it's that degree of notoriety, that's how Mr. Avery comes to you in this case. That may or may not have some things to do with this case.

Now, we understand and the evidence is

going to be clear, that Mr. Avery never should have been convicted in 1985 based upon eyewitness -- or mistaken eyewitness testimony; that there wasn't any DNA evidence, at least the DNA analysis wasn't to the level or to the point that it is now and certainly isn't anything like you are going to hear about in this case; and, in fact, should have been exonerated and was in 2003.

We'll also tell you and at the close of this case I'm going to point to everyone of you presenting jurors and say that that has absolutely nothing to do with this case. When deciding who is accountable for the death of 25 year old Teresa Halbach, Mr. Avery's past and his past exoneration have nothing to do with this case.

Ms Halbach, as you have heard, or she comes in this case as the -- part of a missing persons investigation. Now, Calumet County, and Mr. Wiegert, as a matter of fact, was in charge of that missing persons investigation early on. That's through the 3rd and the 5th. Those parts of the missing persons investigation that happened in Calumet County are Calumet County law

enforcement's responsibility. Those parts of the missing persons investigation that happened in Manitowoc County necessarily and appropriately are Manitowoc County's responsibility.

When looking for a 25 year old freelance photographer, there is nothing improper about Manitowoc County being involved in that case.

You are going to learn, however, that on the 5th, on the 5th of November, at about 2:00 in the afternoon, Judge Jerome Fox, another judge from Manitowoc County, one of the three sitting judges in Manitowoc County, assigned me to be responsible for the prosecution and to assist in the investigation of this particular case.

You have already heard that the reason for that was something called a perceived conflict, an apparent conflict; that is, it may look bad if Manitowoc County remained involved. You are going to hear evidence from many law enforcement officers; in fact, the lead investigators in this case, that there was no actual conflict.

There was nothing that prohibited, or precluded, or legally made it impossible for Manitowoc County to keep performing or keep

assisting in this case. But we all felt it better; myself, Mr. Rohrer, the two district attorneys, Sheriff Pagel and the law enforcement officials for Manitowoc, that the case be transferred over to Calumet County and to DCI, the Division of Criminal Investigation, with the State to lead up the investigation.

Now, you are going to hear that

Manitowoc County officials remained involved in
the case. They remained involved in the
investigation that when manpower, and we are
going to be talking about how many police
officers were necessary, that they remain in a
helping or a support role, but the case is, in
fact, turned over to Calumet County.

This particular photograph, I want you to look at for quite a bit of time as I'm talking. This is the Avery Salvage Yard, located in the Town of Gibson. This is a photo that you are going to see a lot during the course of this case. And this is, for the next six weeks, a property that you are going to come to know very, very well.

And so as Mr. Fallon and Mr. Gahn and I were talking about this opening statement, we

thought it appropriate that we introduce you to
the Avery salvage property. First of all, it's a
40 acre property. The entire square here is 40
acres.

What you also need to understand is that all of these, appear to be little dots, are cars. These are all junked vehicles in the Avery salvage property. And a number that you are going to hear is that there are about 4,000 junked vehicles on the Avery Salvage property.

There's four residences, four places where people live on the Avery salvage property. The first, in the lower left hand corner, which is the northwest corner of the property, is Steven Avery's trailer. That's where Steven Avery lived on the 31st of October.

Living next to Steven was his sister,

Barb Janda. Barb had four sons that were living

with her at the time. But when you kind of look

at this property it's important to know where

Barb Janda's trailer is.

Steven's parents, Allen and Delores

Avery, also had a trailer, had a residence on the

property. And that was up closer to what you

will find out are some business buildings, the

salvage business itself was kind of up in this quadrant, or this corner of the yard.

And, finally, Steven's brother, Charles

Avery, Chuck, also had a trailer on the property.

All right.

Now, you are going to hear that surrounding this property on three sides was an active, working gravel quarry. And so we're going to have some larger aerial photos that we're going to show you in just a minute, but just to give you an idea of what's around this property, not just the 40 acres of search area, but hundreds of acres that surrounded that that were also included in the search.

Members of the jury, the evidence is going to show and you are going to hear from officers, when they talk about the search efforts in this case, that a search area this size is nothing short of overwhelming. All right. All of the places that the officers can look is absolutely overwhelming.

If you know anything about the case you will understand this event. But on Saturday, the 5th of November, Pam and Nikole Sturm, two citizens, two citizen searchers, were given

permission and did search the Avery salvage property.

Pam and Nikole found the needle in the haystack. Pam and Nikole Sturm found the one vehicle on the property that all of the citizen searchers that you are going to hear about were looking for.

Now, there are several things that the evidence is going to show. And as you look at this photograph, several things about the attempts at whoever placed this vehicle here, to disguise it, to hide it, attempts to obscure its detection, you are going to learn, members of the jury, through this evidence in the case, that the vehicle was locked, that the four doors on this vehicle were locked when Pam and Nikole came upon it.

You are going to learn that the license plates were both removed, both the front and back license plates were removed from the vehicle.

You are going to learn the battery was disconnected and you are also going to learn that the vehicle identification number was necessary to, in fact, identify this as Teresa Halbach's vehicle.

Now, the evidence is also going to show you where on the property Teresa Halbach's vehicle was found. It was found in -- not accidentally -- the furthest point from the defendant's trailer. Again, you are going to find that it was intentionally obscured, that it had immediate access to something called a car crusher on the property.

And, again, just to orient you, Steven
Avery's trailer is in the lower left hand portion
of this particular photograph. Where it was
found was not an accident. We'll also tell you,
during the course of the introduction of the
testimony, that it's important where it wasn't
found. It wasn't found on a roadway. Wasn't
found in some mall parking lot. It was found on
the Avery salvage property, the family business
property.

I talked about the car crusher; you will hear a little bit about that piece of equipment that was near or right next to Teresa Halbach's vehicle. You are going to learn and you are going to hear evidence sometime through this six weeks how this piece of equipment works, how a regular looking vehicle, car, SUV, truck, starts

out looking like a regular vehicle and ends up flattened or smashed.

You are going to learn why it's important that Teresa's vehicle was next to the car crusher and you are going to learn the numbers of crushed vehicles and how easily Teresa Halbach's vehicle could never have been found in this case. Could have been slipped in between, if you will, one of those other cars.

You will hear about a lot of professionals that were asked to perform assistance in this case. You are going to hear about law enforcement professionals; you are going to hear about Crime Lab analysts; you are going to hear about some very, very, well qualified expert witnesses.

And all of those professionals have two legs. One of them, though, has four. It's a Belgian Shepherd named Brutus. Brutus is a search and rescue -- or search and recovery dog that is insensitively called a "cadaver dog".

What Brutus does is one thing. Brutus is highly trained. And you are going to hear testimony from Brutus' handler, Julie Cramer. Brutus does one thing and that's find where a

deceased person has been.

The first official, first professional, to approach this vehicle after it's found, after law enforcement secures that area so nobody else can get around there, the first professional was a four legged variety. It was Brutus. It was a canine.

And Brutus, you are going to hear, was asked -- not directed towards this vehicle, but asked to just search around this particular location. You are going to hear evidence that late in the afternoon on the 5th, after the vehicle was found, after a search warrant was already obtained in this case, that Brutus, when approaching Teresa Halbach's vehicle, alerted.

It's called hitting on the vehicle. It
was quite a dramatic alert. And you are going to
hear from Ms Cramer about that. Sadly and
unfortunately, that meant one thing to the
handler and that meant one thing to the lead
investigators in the case. Early on, they
suspected, because of Brutus, because of this
search and rescue dog, because of this cadaver
dog, that a deceased individual either was in the
back of this SUV, or at some point had been in

the back of that SUV.

Now, importantly, you are also going to hear that the police decided not to touch the vehicle at that time. The police decided not to process it even when the Crime Lab was on the scene.

You are going to hear that the Crime Lab loaded this vehicle onto an enclosed trailer, trucked the enclosed and intact SUV all the way to Madison, where on a Sunday, for a very brief amount of time, but mostly on Monday, that vehicle was processed by the experts. Processed by those state agents, by those State Crime Lab expert employees, analysts, when they made some very dramatic and very important findings in the case.

I don't want to get ahead of myself.

Because on November 5th, on that first night, on that first afternoon, there were places to look, as you can imagine. After Teresa Halbach's vehicle was found on the Avery salvage property, Mr. Wiegert, Mr. Fassbender, directing many law enforcement officials, had a job to do.

Now, you saw the size of the Avery salvage property. You are going to hear

testimony from Mr. Fassbender. He's going to provide you with an idea about the methodology, about the plan, the search plan in this case.

You are going to hear Agent Fassbender talk about missing persons investigations and when they go from missing persons to criminal investigations, how their thought process changes. But at that early stage, when they find the vehicle, when they don't know that there is any blood in the back of the vehicle, when they don't know if a body is involved in this case, that Agent Fassbender and every other law enforcement officer, you will hear, at that scene, had one thing in mind and that was to find Teresa. The job of the police at the time was to find Karen Halbach's daughter.

And you are going to hear the evidence that the officers made very, very quick work of searching all of the residences on the Avery salvage property, all of the four residences, all of the outbuildings. They are searching for Teresa Halbach and the search plan, again, is to find the victim, find the victim's body.

But a secondary obligation of theirs is also to look for obvious signs of evidence,

right? You don't have to watch CSI to know that.

At least a first kind of sweep, or a first kind of look through, or a first kind of search of all of these residences are to try to find obvious signs of a crime if, in fact, a crime did occur, or something that is going to help law enforcement find Teresa Halbach. Why I say all that is because Steven Avery -- With search warrant in hand, Steven Avery's residence was searched on the 5th.

Now, again, we're looking for Teresa's body, hopefully alive, but if not, it is important to find if she's on that property.

Steven Avery's garage is searched, other residences, all of the other buildings on the residence are searched, the salvage business itself. But the 4,000 vehicles, in what you will hear was a torrential downpour, were also examined for the first time on the evening of the 5th.

Now, law enforcement officers were involved in that, but Brutus' friends were also involved in that, other canines, the rest of the team, the other search and rescue animals, the canines, were taken in a downpour, in the pitch

dark, out on a 40 acre property. And everyone of these cars was encircled by one of those dogs trying to find Teresa Halbach.

Please recall, at this early stage, the police don't know what they are looking for yet. They don't really have an idea yet of the kinds of things that they are looking for. So when you remember this search plan, you will hear evidence and some officers may even call it the funnel approach, nothing fancy about calling it the funnel approach, it makes sense.

It is actually an interviewing technique as well.

But it's a way to find evidence in a funnel type of approach. We're looking for the body first.

Then we're looking for obvious signs of evidence.

Then as you get closer and closer into more detail, more thorough, more directed searches, because you are able to go back into all of those places and all of those properties, that's the methodology.

And as you hear officers testify
throughout this case, when they testify on the
witness stand, remember that funnel approach.
Remember that kind of methodology as they talk

about these kinds of things. But make no mistake, that on the first night, they are looking for Teresa and they are hoping to find Teresa alive.

When that was unsuccessful, the next morning, on the 6th, Mr. Fassbender, Mr. Wiegert, were able to secure some help. They needed bodies. They needed some cops. They needed some volunteers. And so they got volunteer firefighters from all over the Manitowoc and Calumet County areas.

And they all showed up in force, en masse, on the morning of Sunday, November 6th.

And for the first time, everyone of those 4,000 vehicles was opened up. Everyone of those 4,000 trunks was opened by a firefighter with a police officer with them, looking for the body of Teresa Halbach.

Also on Sunday, November 6th, a firearm was found, or recovered; it was actually found the evening before. But it was seized; it was recovered. It was hanging over the bed of the defendant, Steven Avery. He thought it was appropriate to recover that as a piece of evidence and, in fact, it was.

You are going to hear that the brand name of this semi-automatic .22 caliber rifle is Marlin. You are going to hear that it is something called tube loaded. Not that any of these things are going to mean much to you at this point, but there are a number of bullets that are able to be loaded into this semi-automatic rifle.

I

You are going to hear, by the way, although hanging over Mr. Avery's bed and his exercising control over that, should be obvious that on the 31st of October, Mr. Avery exercised a great deal more control.

A deserving piece of evidence was seized on the -- Sunday, the 6th of November. And it is, what we believe, the last recorded voice of 25 year old Teresa Halbach. When Mr. Avery, the evidence will show, made arrangements to have this young woman come out to his property that afternoon, he didn't use his own name.

He didn't use the name Steven Avery.

Even though Ms Halbach had been out to the property, as I told you, on a number of occasions before; Mr. Avery used a different person's name. He used the name B. Janda, the initial B. Janda,

J-a-n-d-a. That's Barb Janda, can be Barb Janda, but when we called the Auto Trader Magazine people in Milwaukee, and you are going to hear from Ms Schuster and Ms Pliszka, two employees of Auto Trader, Mr. Avery used the name and used the number for B. Janda.

Teresa Halbach doesn't know who B. Janda is. You are going to hear evidence that Ms Halbach called back the telephone number for Barb Janda and she left this voice mail. This voice mail was recovered, was retrieved. You are going to hear this voice mail.

And you are going to hear from Teresa in her own words, in this courtroom, that she got the message, that she knows that you want me to come out to the property. Teresa Halbach tells

B. Janda that she's going to be out there sometime after 2:00 p.m., that very day, on the 31st of October.

This will be important for you in determining a timeline. Where was Teresa all that day; was this before or after she went to the Schmitz photo shoot and the Zipperer photo shoot. That's going to be uncontroverted.

Absolutely, this is the last stop that she made

on the 31st of October.

Two days into this, folks, we're now on Monday, the 7th of November, and the first results come from the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory. The first results find several things.

First of all, in the back cargo area of Teresa's SUV, they find that there's female blood. They find there is a lot of female blood in the back of Teresa's SUV. But they also found, interestingly, male blood, at least at that early stage with their early typing, they could find that it was male blood.

And interestingly and importantly that already on Monday, the 7th of November, there is male blood found in the victim's vehicle in at least six different locations. Six different places they find male blood. Mr. Wiegert, Mr. Fassbender, all of the investigators don't understand the significance of the male blood being in six different places. They do, however, understand the significance of a lot of female blood. And they suspect early on that something horrible has come to Teresa Halbach.

Also on Monday, a burn barrel was

discovered, not just any burn barrel. Again, here's a picture, an overview, a part of the aerial photograph of the Avery property itself. There is Steven Avery's trailer and located outside of Steven Avery's trailer was a burn barrel that was recovered.

Now, again, not just any burn barrel, but Steven Avery's burn barrel. And you will hear later in my opening and you will hear a lot of evidence about the trial, about what critical pieces of information were found from that burn barrel. But put it in perspective, on Monday, that was found.

Example for you of where that burn barrel was in relationship, not only to the proximity of Steven Avery's trailer, but the proximity to this red Dodge Caravan. You may also have guessed, this is the car that Steven Avery asked Teresa Halbach to come take a picture of. All right. So the proximity of the burn barrel to his front door and also to the Dodge Caravan will be important in the determination at the close of this case when you decide who was responsible for these crimes.

The next day, three critical pieces of evidence are found on Tuesday, the 8th. Now, we talked about these more detailed searches. On Tuesday, one of these more detailed searches occurred in Mr. Avery's trailer.

.23

You are going to hear evidence that this bookcase was pulled out, was jostled about. You are going to hear evidence about this particular binder having been pulled out of the bookcase.

And after the officers looked through it, how it was slammed back in as the book case was actually pulled out from the wall.

And after jostling and after searching it, after slamming things around and after putting the bookcase back in its location, you are going to hear this is what the officers saw. They saw a Toyota vehicle key in the bedroom of Mr. Avery. You are going to hear evidence that it had obvious evidentiary value, that the officers at that time stopped what they were doing and Investigator Dan Kucharski of the Calumet County Sheriff's Department seized or took control of that key during that more detailed search.

More detailed searches were also

occurring at the same time of the entire Avery Salvage Yard, which included now officers, volunteer firefighters, going through all of the cars again; 4,000 searches occurred again, on Tuesday. But you are going to hear this time they weren't looking for a body, at this time they were looking for stuff. They were looking for evidence.

After the body wasn't found in their first search, they are going back and they are looking for items of obvious evidentiary value. You are going to hear testimony they found something of obvious evidentiary value; they found the victim, Teresa Halbach's, license plates crumpled up in a station wagon.

I just show you this slide to show you what the vehicle looked like, the station wagon that the license plates were found in. And also provide this aerial photograph to give you an idea of the vehicle that the license plates were found in.

Very quickly, I want to remind you of
Steven Avery's trailer is down in the lower left
hand corner; that the access road leading to
Mr. Avery's trailer comes from the top of this

figure down towards the right. Teresa Halbach's vehicle is found in the first vehicle (sic) next to the access road on its way to Steven Avery's trailer. Again, the evidence is going to show, not by accident, the proximity to the defendant's roadway, the proximity to the defendant's trailer, all becoming important.

Now, I told you that there were three important discoveries on the 8th. And the third and perhaps the most important discovery that day is something that's being referred to as a burn area. Again, just to orient you, it's the same kind of picture that we have been looking at: Steven Avery's trailer; Steven Avery's garage. The Dodge Caravan, the van that Ms Halbach was taking pictures of, was located right there; and there's the burn area.

The proximity of this burn area to the garage is obvious; the proximity of this burn area to Mr. Avery's trailer itself is obvious.

To provide you with another view of this burn area, again located -- you can see his trailer, you can see the garage on the right.

But, importantly, that burn area contained human remains. It contained obvious

bone fragments. Even to the untrained officers that stumbled upon this particular burn area, even when they called over the Crime Lab to process this particular location, it was obvious that there were human remains in this particular burn area.

Now, this next picture is particularly important because it was taken before any processing begins. There's the burn area that we're talking about. That's the burn area that contained the obvious human remains. You will see and you will hear from the officers who were at the scene, that this burn area, from the first night, was guarded, was guarded by Mr. Avery's German Shepherd. I believe his name was Bear.

But this particular German Shepherd, not of the friendly sort, did not allow law enforcement officers to get close to this burn area. Did not allow any of the canine help that was out there to get close to that area. And any time -- excuse me -- law enforcement even got close to the burn area, Bear made sure that they were shooed away.

But I think it's also important about this case, when we talk about proximity, there

isn't any question who exercises control over this burn area. And in the background, just -- just see how close it is to that van that Teresa Halbach was asked to take a picture of.

The next day, Wednesday, November 9th, was the first time that recovered bone fragments from that burn area are identified by an anthropologist. An anthropologist is a professional who looks at bones and can identify whether they are human, or that they are non-human, where they go. We'll talk about that a little bit later.

But even though these fragments are small, even though they are burned almost beyond recognition, on Wednesday, the 9th, they determined that those were, in fact, adult female remains found right behind the defendant's garage.

All right. This is the first image that is not a photograph that I'm showing you. This is computer generated. And we're going to hear from a man who created these images. His name is Tim Austin. He works for the State patrol, the State of Wisconsin, in scene reconstruction.

And what Tim Austin will tell you is

that he was out at the scene -- and we'll talk about this a little bit later -- but he was out at the scene and took over 4100 measurements out at the scene. And after taking his own photographs and after taking over 4100 images -- excuse me -- measurements, he was able to recreate some of these scenes for you, for the jury.

And these are created for the jury so that you can see things that the naked eye can't see; so that you can see things that photographs can't show; so that you can see relationships between some evidence and fixed objects or other evidence that's found. And so as you see this perspective you will see that you are up, you know, dozens of feet above the ground. And it's something, again, unless you are that tall, you are not going to be able to see this kind of location.

But this particular computer generated animation is important to embrace or to -- for a jury to look at in the case because the burn area is clearly visible. How close it is to Mr. Avery's garage; how close it is to the trailer; how close it is to the other area,

what's called the curtilage, that is the area that surrounds Mr. Avery's property, all becomes important.

1.8

All right. So these are -- And when something is not a picture, when it, in fact, was created through computer animation or computer generation, I will let you know that.

One of the bones that was recovered was a long bone. And I'm showing you this for a reason, in my opening statement, so that you understand what we're looking at here. That we aren't just looking at some bone in abstract.

We're not just looking at some DNA profile.

It's Teresa Halbach's shinbone. All right. It's Karen Halbach's daughter's tibia. And attached to Teresa Halbach's tibia was some tissue. Now, despite Mr. Avery -- The evidence will show, that despite Mr. Avery's effort to completely obliterate all these bones, by burning, to incinerate these bones completely, this bone survived.

This tissue that was on the bone survived, which allowed a DNA match, which allowed the State of Wisconsin analyst, guess who, Sherry Culhane, when she performed an

analysis on that tissue, to match it with the blood found in the back of the SUV; with a soda can that is found in the front of the SUV; and with a standard.

2.2

Now, the standard is also called an exemplar. You are going to hear those two statements, but Teresa Halbach, before the 31st of October, had a Pap smear performed, a cervical swab that was performed. And thankfully for us, that was kept at Bellin, up in Green Bay. Well, Sherry, also -- Ms Culhane, also, was able to develop a DNA profile from the Pap smear.

We know that's Teresa. And from that exemplar, from that example, matches the tissue on the leg bone; matches the blood; matches the soda can. We can say with 100 percent certainty that those human remains are those of Teresa Halbach.

The first 11 days of this case become extremely important. And for just about five minutes here, I want to give you those 11 days in. And what you have just heard, that part of the investigation, you have only heard 11 days worth of investigation, which has gone on 15 months now. But the first 11 days are important

and I want to just run through those for you.

Ms Halbach is killed on the 31st of October, at the Steven Avery salvage property, sometime after 2:45 p.m. You are going to hear from a gentleman by the name of Tom Pearce, who is Teresa Halbach's business partner, that she doesn't show up for work on the 1st or 2nd.

And on the 3rd, Teresa Halbach is reported missing to law enforcement authorities. That's when the missing persons investigation, from a law enforcement standpoint, begins. I think, if you will, as to the feelings of the Halbach family and friends and how worried they are even on the 3rd.

But on the 4th, you are going to hear from a witness named Ryan Hillegas who helped coordinate the citizen search efforts.

You are going to hear that there was something called cell tracking. We're going to hear a little bit about that. A cell phone actually is almost a transmitting device and it pings or beeps, if you will, off of cell towers all over the state, whenever you carry it in your pocket, whether it's on or not. You are going to hear evidence about attempts to find Teresa's

cell phone; if we find her cell phone, we can find Teresa

We also looked at those early stages for whether or not she used any of her credit cards.

Where is Teresa Halbach? We try to find that out.

You are going to hear that a gentleman

by the name of Curt Drumm, a pilot in the

Manitowoc area, volunteered his airplane and

helped law enforcement fly over Mr. Zipperer's

residence and Mr. Schmitz's residence and the

Avery compound and any of the roads that may have

led to and from there to try and find Teresa

Halbach.

On the 5th, we know that Teresa's vehicle was found at the Avery salvage property. You will hear that search warrants were obtained. You will hear during the course of this case that a search warrant is nothing more than a piece of paper. It's a judicial authorization; a judge authorizes law enforcement officers to search the property, in private areas. And we got many, many search warrants in this case and searched for her body.

You have heard already, that on the 6th,

firearms are obtained or taken from Mr. Avery's bedroom; his garage is searched, at least the first search of the garage for those items of obvious evidentiary value. But remember, on that Sunday we don't have any results yet, from the Crime Lab. Those don't come until sometime on Monday, when the Crime Lab determines that both male and female blood is located in the SUV.

We search, for the first time, all of the junked vehicles, at least all of the trunks are searched.

And Mr. Avery's burn barrel is discovered and searched.

And other things will happen and you are going to hear from other officers that the surrounding areas, not just the 40 acres, but hundreds of acres of gravel pits and the like are being searched in these early days.

On Tuesday, perhaps the most important of all the days as far as discoveries go, those three critical discoveries are made: The Toyota key, the license plates, and the burn area behind the defendant's property.

On Wednesday, the 9th, there is an identification made of male blood in the victim's

vehicle. That blood matches the DNA profile of
the defendant, Steven Avery. And bones are
recovered and determined to be that of an adult
female.

You will hear on the 10th, on Thursday, the burn area is further excavated by arson investigators and other Crime Lab and other types of officials but, interestingly, the defendant's DNA is now found on the key.

And, finally, on Friday, the 11th, the female blood that was found, the great pool, if you will, of female blood, in the cargo area, is now matched. It is determined to match the soda can -- the saliva from the diet Wild Cherry Pepsi, I believe, soda can in the front of Teresa's car. The blood is now presumed to be that of the victim, Teresa Halbach.

You have heard the term that they told me there would be no math, well, there is going to be some science. And here's where I have to at least give you an overview of what the science of this case is going to be.

The science, the blood part of the science, the DNA analysis and explanation of this case is going to come from this gentleman right

here, Norm Gahn. Mr. Gahn, you will learn by his examination, is quite knowledgable in DNA and DNA from a prosecution standpoint. And in all honesty and in all candor, that's why he was added to the prosecution team, because this is such an important part of the case. The science becomes very, very important.

You are going to hear about a DNA analyst from the Wisconsin Crime Lab named Sherry Culhane. Again, Ms Culhane, almost unbelievably, is the very analyst that exonerates Mr. Steven Avery several years earlier. She's the same analyst that does the detailed DNA work on Mr. Avery's work with the Innocence Project and frees Mr. Avery from his incarceration.

Well, that same woman, Sherry Culhane, processes this vehicle. Because she's the unit head, because this is such an important case, she does the work herself. She does all of the analysis of all of the blood that's found in these cases.

You are going to hear from Ms Culhane, through the assistance of Mr. Gahn, what DNA is, that it is a genetic fingerprint, if you will. Provides an opportunity, as most of you may

already know, to take a sample and to take a unknown sample, something like blood that's found in the back of an SUV and to take a known DNA sample, since our DNA is all the same in all of our bodily fluids.

Our blood has the same DNA as our saliva, as our semen, as the skin cells, as our tissue; it's all the same DNA. So once you develop a profile, each of us all has different DNA; it's unique to each of us. And Mr. Gahn will explain all of that for you.

But with that as the background, Ms

Culhane was able to establish all of the places
in that SUV that had Teresa Halbach's DNA. You
are going to learn that they found a large
quantity of the blood and DNA in the cargo floor
and the side panel. The back cargo door, you are
going to hear that there were splatters, spatters
of Teresa's blood in the back cargo door.

You are going to hear that on the rear tailgate there were droplets of Teresa's blood; her DNA is found on the door handle; and, also, as I have already alluded and you might expect, the saliva from the soda can, Ms Culhane will find DNA evidence.

I told you about male blood that was in the SUV. On Wednesday, the 9th of November, Steven Avery subjected to a very thorough medical examination, again, as result of a warrant, as a result of a judicial authorization to do that particular kind of examination. And what they found was a very, very deep cut to Mr. Avery's right middle finger but, importantly, on the outside of his right middle finger. And that's where the cut was.

This cut was actively bleeding on the 31st of October. And I guess, thankfully, for the State. And as a jury, I hope at the conclusion of this case you will say thankfully for you. Because DNA analysis was then possible because of his actively bleeding, of his leaving his DNA behind, inside of Teresa's vehicle.

Ms Culhane will tell you that the defendant's blood was found in at least six places in Teresa Halbach's SUV including the rear passenger door, smeared or wiped on the rear passenger door. Okay. There's a front door; there's a back door; kind of like a four door car. It was in the backdoor and it's along the edge or along the metal of the rear passenger

door. That's Steven Avery's blood. That's how much blood he left on the side of the door.

We have heard about the defendant's blood on the ignition. That positively matched that of Steven Avery. As you think about this case and I will argue at the end of the case, but there isn't any secret and the defense understands this is as well, an actively bleeding middle right finger. And when you look at the -- excuse me -- When you look at the smear, kind of visualize turning the ignition and how that can smear from the outside of the middle finger and leave that particular kind of DNA evidence.

Other places that the defendant bled inside of the victim's car included blood on her CD case in her front seat. Both front seats had droplets of Mr. Avery's blood on it. The rear tailgate, remember I told you there was a droplet of Teresa's blood; because Mr. Avery is actively bleeding, there is a droplet of his blood as well. And also on the front console floor, is kind of up in that particular area.

Sherry Culhane and Mr. Gahn are better able to explain all those for you, but it's important for you to know. Now, again, the

jigsaw puzzle, when you hear the evidence and when you have to decide who killed Teresa Halbach, this evidence points to one person.

Now, Mr. Gahn and his questioning, and
Ms Culhane is going to tell you, that DNA
evidence, again, is not just from blood. It can
be from skin cells which are left through
perspiration, sweat, okay, saliva and sweat and
all those other kinds of bodily fluids that we
talked about. So when somebody's hands are
sweating and you handle something, it's possible
that you can leave your DNA on that thing that
you handled.

You heard a suggestion already in which there will be evidence in this case that the battery was disconnected on Ms Halbach's vehicle. We'll tell you, or at least we'll argue as to why that happened. But importantly, in reaching up underneath the hood, to open up Teresa Halbach's vehicle, Mr. Avery was kind enough to leave his DNA on the hood latch. Okay. That will come from Sherry Culhane as well.

In handling Ms Halbach's key that starts the ignition and putting it into his bedroom, Mr. Avery was kind enough to leave his DNA on

that portion of the Toyota key that was found.

So that's part of the science.

Other science is going to include things like teeth, teeth that were recovered from the burn area. This part of the science, by the way, will be handled by Mr. Fallon, and other expert witnesses, but most importantly, through somebody called a forensic odontologist.

That's a big word, kind of scared me when I first heard it. Gentleman's name is Dr. Donald Simley. Mr. Simley is a odontologist. From a forensic standpoint, it's kind of a dentist who matches stuff up.

So Mr -- or Dr. Simley, the dentist, the odontologist, will show you a -- what's called a panorex x-ray. We went to Teresa's dentist. We got her x-rays from when she had work being done and Dr. Simley will show you tooth number 31, which is the second last tooth in the bottom left jaw.

Dr. Simley will also tell you that x-rays were taken of teeth that were found from the burn area. He will show you tooth number 31 that was actually recovered from the burn area and will allow the jury to make their own

comparisons.

We talked about an anthropologist. Our anthropologist is Dr. Leslie Eisenberg.

Dr. Eisenberg will tell you about her credentials, about how she does this -- this whole kind of work. And although, unfortunately, the bones that she had to deal with and, again, we aren't talking about a full skeleton that was found in that -- that bone (sic) pit.

If we did, by the way, we may not be including a charge against Mr. Avery for mutilation of a corpse. But mutilation of this little girl -- excuse me -- not this little girl, but this young woman, absolutely occurred.

Because this is what's left, small tiny pieces of bone fragment.

And when you talk about a jigsaw puzzle, when you talk about trying to put all of this together; it's a very, very difficult process.

And when I asked -- And the testimony, actually, of Dr. Eisenberg is going to allude to this jigsaw puzzle kind of analogy and we don't even have a box or a cover to go on. Luckily for us and luckily for you, Leslie Eisenberg is your jigsaw puzzle covered box.

In other words, Dr. Eisenberg knows where everyone of these bones goes.

Dr. Eisenberg will identify all of these bone fragments. She'll identify, from a female skeleton and from examples that are used, all of the different parts of Teresa that were found.

Okay. And it will help you as far as identification processes go, as to what parts of Teresa's bones and what parts of the body were actually recovered in this case.

Now, not all evidence is of equal weight. And two really important pieces of bone were found. And those were two pieces of what are called the cranium, the skull, that were burned very, very badly but were identified as such by Dr. Eisenberg.

The parts of the skull, this picture that you are looking at is actually a part of the skull now. This brilliant woman is going to tell you that this isn't just part of the skull, but this is a little piece of the skull that's just on top of or over somebody's left ear.

How do you tell that kind of thing looking at a bone like that, but that's what an anthropologist apparently -- apparently does.

And that's why she's an expert, and we're not, in this area. But, importantly, the damage, the defect that's caused, the evidence is going to show that you are looking at the inside, from the inside out, the inside of Teresa's skull out; that the circular or half circle -- because this isn't the full piece, this is half of the important piece here -- is extremely important.

The defect, the damage here, the testimony will be, is caused by a high velocity projectile. We take this same bone fragment and you are going to hear evidence about other experts and it allows some other analysis of this particular piece of bone, this particular piece of cranium.

You are going to hear from a gentleman by the name of Ken Olsen from the Crime Lab; he is an expert in trace evidence, the CSI kind of stuff, but the trace from an elemental standpoint. When you x-ray something, the evidence is going to show bone and other kinds of vascular or veins and things show up after you x-ray even a burned piece of bone.

But what also shows up are things that don't burn up. All right. When Mr. Olsen

testifies, he's going to point to these little
bright dots. See those okay from there? These
little bright dots that are right on the lip of
the cranial defect.

Those little bright dots he's going to say he examined. He recovered those and he did his analysis on them, elemental analysis, and found that they are lead. These little dots are lead, what's called lead spray. You are going to hear testimony that there's only one thing, only one item that can travel fast enough, as a projectile, to cause this kind of a defect and also leave lead. And as you might predict, that's a bullet. All right. Lead spray is left by bullets.

Dr. Eisenberg, then, with the assistance of a gentleman by the name of Jeffrey Jentzen, is the Milwaukee County Medical Examiner.

Dr. Jentzen, has -- and you will hear he has a great deal of experience nationally, a national expert in things like gunshot wounds.

Dr. Jentzen and Dr. Eisenberg will render two expert opinions: First of all, that the left parietal region, the region just above the left ear, the thing that you just saw, the

combination of the projectile and the lead spray, leads these two experts -- and especially the pathologist -- especially Dr. Jentzen, who will tell you that that's an entrance wound, just above the left ear of Teresa Halbach.

They will also find a second and we will show you a second entrance wound, similar kind of defect that's found in a recovered bone that is on what's called the occipital region of the skull. That's to the back and just to the left side of the back of the skull and that was a second entrance wound.

Finally, their opinion, when they put together -- when you ask of the State, what was the cause of death, what was the mechanism of death, at the conclusion of this case I will be able to tell you, this was a homicide and it included at least two gunshot wounds to the head of 25 year old Teresa Halbach.

I'm almost done so hang on. Remember this burn barrel, remember found outside of Mr. Avery's trailer, well, this burn barrel, as I told you, was examined. And although Mr. Avery, the evidence will show you, attempted to burn up all of the stuff that was in the burn barrel, it

didn't burn. It didn't burn up.

And the things that didn't burn up were electronic components. All of these electronic components were found in Mr. Avery's burn barrel. This is other evidence. This is more evidence, not just the science, not just the DNA, not just the blood, but at the conclusion of the case will be other evidence that will be able to assist you in pointing to who killed Teresa Halbach.

Of those electronic components, included Teresa's cell phone. You will hear evidence that Teresa had a Motorola V3 RAZR cell phone. And when we look at and when the experts show you those electronic components that are found within the burn barrel, you will recognize or some of you might, the Motorola sign.

But for those of you that don't, we're going to have a gentleman by the name of Mr. Thomas from the FBI come here from Virginia and he's going to show you all those components and he's going to show you what they looked like when they were recovered from Mr. Avery's burn barrel and what they used to look like on a Motorola V3 RAZR cell phone. All right. So you are going to be able to match up the components

itself and what it used to look like before Mr.

Avery's attempts to destroy that evidence as

well.

You are going to hear about a digital camera that Teresa Halbach had; digital camera that she used to take pictures was a Canon A310, PowerShot A310. You are going to hear all kinds of interesting evidence about how a digital camera -- and some of you may know this and certainly our media friends know this. But when you take a picture with a digital camera, that photo, that image that you take with a digital camera leaves a signature. It leaves an electronic imprint on the image itself.

And so, if you put that picture on a laptop computer or your home computer and you take your little mouse and put what's called the cursor, the little arrow thing, over the picture itself, it gives you an incredible amount of information. Gives you the date that that picture was taken. It tells you things about the picture itself, including what kind of camera was used.

And you are going to learn and you are going to see at least six different pictures that

were taken at Steven Avery's property by Teresa
Halbach. And all six of those include that
little imprint, include that signature, will tell
you conclusively that Teresa uses the Canon
PowerShot A310. All right.

We'll have these even more blown up for you, but that says PowerShot A310. There isn't going to be any question at all about whose camera it was that Mr. Avery burned in his burn barrel on the 31st of October.

You are going to hear about those other electronic components, by the way. I don't know if you use a palm pilot or a PDA, a personal data assistant. Teresa had one of those. That was also burned up and found in that burn barrel with some other information.

But when on the topic of what other evidence, what additional evidence, we're not done there folks. All right. We have other evidence that we have developed in the last 15 months. You are going to learn that in Mr. Avery's garage, after shooting the bullets into 25 year old Teresa Halbach, they ejected what are called shell casings.

Those are the little brass casings that

come out of a gun after you shoot the gun. Well, it's possible for experts, for toolmark experts from the Crime Lab to match up those shell casings with a specific gun. And they will, in fact, match that .22 caliber rifle that's hanging over Mr. Avery's bed.

Now, March 1st and 2nd, 2 bullets were found, also, in Mr. Avery's garage. Through a more detailed search, you will find out why that happened. Through a more detailed search of the garage, two bullet fragments were found in Avery's garage. One of those bullet fragments, after going through Teresa Halbach, included Teresa's DNA.

And so as a matter, through Mr. Gahn and through his experts, you will learn that Teresa helped you too, that she left behind some evidence for you to consider in this case.

Teresa left behind her DNA for you to consider on one of the bullets that's found in the defendant, Mr. Avery's, garage.

You will hear about things like phone calls. You'll hear about how phone calls can't be changed in the records and we can provide a timeline as to when certain things happened; when

Mr. Avery called for Teresa; when he called her two times before she ever got there; and when he places a -- what we're going to be called an alibi call, two hours after she's already at the property. You are going to hear about all those kinds of phone calls.

And as I mentioned, at least briefly, before other analysis of bone and tissue, other things to point to, if in fact the State even question whose bones and whose tissue it is behind Mr. Avery's property.

Lastly, I just want to remind you of the kinds of exhibits that you are going to hear in this case. You are going to see items that were seized, stuff that was seized from the scene, from Mr. Avery's property. You are going to get photographs from out at the scene, but you are also going to see photographs after the evidence was already obtained so that you have a more pristine or a better view of some of this evidence.

You are going to look at documents and records. You are going to hear from experts.

And they will provide some written expert reports and also summary and demonstrative exhibits.

1 2

3 4 5

.17

 Just a little bit on summary exhibits.

When there's lots of evidence like documents;

lots of things in documents, phone records, you know, things like this; when it's hard for you to digest, we'll try to create a one or a two page summary of all that information to help the jury and find out exactly what all of it means.

And, finally, audio and videotaped kinds of evidence, you would expect to find those kinds of things.

Remember I told you before, just talking about different kinds of photos, about those pictures that Teresa took, those six different pictures; this is one of them. It was taken on June 20th, by Teresa Halbach.

I use this as the example because -because I wanted to. But it shows very clearly
Mr. Avery's trailer, his garage. It's clear
through Auto Trader Magazine, when Mr. Avery, in
June of this year tried to sell this particular
trailer, Teresa Halbach took this picture, again,
with a Canon PowerShot A310. You will hear all
those kind of things.

But the reason, at least for this part of the presentation, I'm showing you this, is it

tells you a difference between a scene photo and things that I mentioned at least briefly before; computer generated scene models. Again, this isn't a picture. This is a -- provided by Mr. Austin, but you will note that it's something that you couldn't see with your eye.

Again, usually there's elevations that are involved. These kinds of models are, by the way, within an inch, you will hear, accurate.

Every measurement is within an inch. So this isn't some blackboard that was taken down and you just do the best you can.

And these are 4100 measurements that make everything geometrically perfect, geometrically accurate to within an inch. But these kinds of models should assist you. Since it's the middle of February, we're not going to be traipsing off to the Avery property.

These kinds of things may help you in understanding better and getting a better tour of the Avery property. But just this model, as an example, shows you how close Mr. Avery's burn barrel is to his front door; how close it is to the vehicle that Ms Halbach took pictures of.

And even things like after taking the pictures,

the path that Teresa Halbach took as she walked towards Mr. Avery's property.

For those of you big picture people, not detail oriented people, you all were asked that question, we'll have aerial photographs for you.

Again, when we look at all of the surrounding gravel pits on at least three sides of the Avery property and how that may fit into some of those kind of things.

We have interior photos as well. Photos of the inside of Mr. Avery's garage. Now, you will note a couple things about this photo.

First of all, you will note how cluttered, to say the least, that it is. And this might help you understand how difficult it was for officers, not knowing what they are looking for, in November, to kind of go through this garage, not knowing that the shooting -- not knowing that the shooting happened in this garage. The officers didn't really know what they were looking for.

But in March, when this picture was taken, and they know what they are looking for and they know where to look in the garage, these kind of pictures should be able to help you. But Mr. Austin also will help you in giving you a

geometric perspective, ripping the roof off, if you will, of the garage and show you models of the insides of the garage.

guestion why I'm showing you this exhibit, one of the bullets, number 9, which was found in the crack of a -- the cement, that was not cleaned up in this case. And tent number 23A, underneath what was a air compressor, the evidence is going to show, is the bullet that Teresa left her DNA for you. Underneath that air compressor is where they recovered that second bullet.

Other interior photos, you are going to see photos of the interior of Mr. Avery's bedroom, the gun rack that hangs over Mr. Avery's bed with two firearms, one was a .50 caliber muzzleloader and on top of that was a .22 caliber automatic -- semi-automatic rifle.

But Mr. Austin, again, provides you with, ripping off the roof, if you will, interior scene models, where you are going to be able to look at the living room of Mr. Avery and his spare bedroom and his bathroom and Mr. Avery's master bedroom, be able to kind of walk around within that space. So it will help you

understand where some of these evidence -- or some of this evidence was found.

Finally, the kinds of witnesses that you are going to hear from, include citizens and law enforcement officers and records kinds of people; although, most of those will be agreed to between Mr. Strang and us, as well as expert witnesses.

You will hear from various kinds of citizens like Bobby Dassey, who is one of the sons of Barb Janda, who you will hear testimony about, that at about 2:45 on the 31st of October, Bobby saw a young girl drive up to the Avery property.

Bobby Dassey saw this young girl, later identified as Teresa Halbach, get out of her teal, or blue, or green colored SUV and actually take pictures of the van that her mom had for sale. Bobby Dassey is going to tell you, that after looking out the window and after seeing Teresa Halbach take these photographs of this vehicle and finish her job, that Teresa walked towards Steven Avery's trailer.

You will hear evidence that she was walking towards the main entrance of Steven

Avery's trailer and that Bobby thereafter took a

shower and left to go deer hunting, bow hunting, about 15 minutes later. You are going to hear from Bobby that when he left 15 minutes later, Teresa's SUV was there, but Teresa was nowhere to be found.

You are going to hear that Bobby Dassey was the last person, the last citizen that will have seen Teresa Halbach alive. You are going to hear from other citizens like that, other people that will help place this case into context for us.

Juries are triers of fact. You don't decide what the law is, the judge does that. But you decide what the facts of the case are. And the facts in this case aren't just going to point to who did it; it's not just a who done it case. It's a what happened and where it happened and when it happened.

But we're also going to provide you evidence, not just that Steven Avery did it, but to the exclusion of other people as well. In other words, positive evidence about who done know it, but also negative evidence of why that necessarily excludes others. And so you get to find those facts and at the end of this case, you

will search for the truth. You are not to search for doubt, you are to search for the truth.

I told you when you started this case and when this opening statement started, that this may, in fact, be the most important decision that you will ever -- going to make.

That leaves us, then, with the end. I'm going to remind you through this case, I'm not going to apologize about it, but this is Teresa Halbach. I'm not going to apologize about the fact that this is not a DNA profile number. This isn't a box of recovered bones, but as I have mentioned before, remembering the humanity of Teresa Halbach. Remembering who she is, what she meant to these people, is an important part of this process.

Ultimately, this process includes assigning accountability. It will require you to assign responsibility for the murder and mutilation of an innocent 25 year old young lady. I'm confident, members of the jury, that after the conclusion of this, what could in fact be a six week trial, that you are going to agree with me. You are going to agree with the State that we have met our burden, that is, beyond a

reasonable doubt. I will ask at the conclusion of this case, that you return verdicts of guilty. Thank you. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kratz. Members of the jury, it's quarter to 12. It's a little earlier than we normally take our lunch break, but I don't believe there is time enough to get started with anything else before lunch.

During the course of the trial the Court will attempt to give you a break every hour and a half or so, because I realize that your attention is required and sitting for much longer than that can impair your attention.

I do want to remind you at this time, as
I will periodically throughout the trial, that
you are not to begin your deliberations and
discussion of the case until all of the evidence
is presented and I instruct you on law at the
conclusion of the case.

Do not discuss the case among yourselves, including the opening statement given today, or with anyone one else, until you begin your final deliberations in the jury room. We'll take our lunch break now and resume at 1:00.

(Jury not present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Counsel, in 1 terms of the schedule for this afternoon, is the 2 3 State going to have some evidence to present after 4 the opening statement? ATTORNEY KRATZ: We will, Judge, we'll have 5 6 as many witnesses as the Court wants to proceed with 7 this afternoon. THE COURT: All right. We'll see you back 8 9 at 1:00. 10 ATTORNEY STRANG: I have just one quick --11 THE COURT: Go ahead. 12 ATTORNEY STRANG: -- matter if I might. 13 I decided against interrupting 14 Mr. Kratz's opening statement because I thought 15 this could wait, honestly, and I don't like to 16 interrupt someone's opening. But probably in the 17 first 20 minutes of his opening, Mr. Kratz 18 explained to the jurors that the presumption of 19 innocence persists only until that moment when 20 the evidence overcomes it and proves guilt, 21 beyond a reasonable doubt. 22 I understand -- I understand the 23 argument. I understand what was meant, no ill 24 intent was meant, but that's enough of a

variation from the actual instruction that the

25

presumption of innocence attends the defendant until after closing arguments and deliberations begin, that I simply would ask the Court to repeat part of that presumption of innocence instruction this afternoon, before I start.

We don't have to make a big deal out of it; I just thought an abbreviated reminder might help. I also noted in the State's Power Point slide that explained the element of false imprisonment that the language, during her lifetime, was omitted.

That's, I think, the kind of thing that the Court already has covered and can cover again, but it might be a good idea, and this covers me too, for the Court simply to remind the jury that all legal instructions come from the Court in the end.

THE COURT: All right. I did -- I do

recall the statement regarding the presumption of
innocence that you referred to. And I do agree that
the precise extemporaneous statement for Mr. Kratz
is not technically correct. I'm going to grant your
request and repeat the presumption of innocence
instruction before you give your opening.

The other item about during the victim's

lifetime, I think I covered in the initial 1 2 instructions, again, and I'm confident that six 3 weeks from now the jury will have forgotten any subtle distinction that may have taken place in 4 5 the opening. But I will repeat the presumption 5 of innocence instruction without giving any 7 specific reason why --8 ATTORNEY STRANG: No. 9 THE COURT: -- because I doubt that the 10 jury caught the significance of it, but it was 11 technically incorrect. 12 ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. And it was 13 unintended and there doesn't have to be a big deal 14 made about this. 15 THE COURT: All right. Anything else 16 before we break? 17 ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, that's fine, Judge, 18 thank you. 19 (Noon recess taken.) 20 THE COURT: Members of the jury, a question 21 came up during break concerning the definition of 22 presumption of innocence, so I'm going to read that 23 excerpt to you again at this time, from the opening instructions I gave you earlier. Then we'll hear

the opening statement from the defense.

24

Defendants are not required to prove
their innocence. The law presumes every person
charged with the commission of an offense to be
innocent. This presumption requires a finding of
not guilty unless in your deliberations you find
it is overcome by evidence which satisfies you,
beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is
guilty. Mr. Strang, at this time you may begin.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you, your Honor.

Good afternoon. This summer it will be 22 years, 22 years since a woman running on the beach in

Manitowoc was raped and beaten nearly to death. The

Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department investigated those awful crimes and they charged Steven Avery with rape and attempted murder on that Manitowoc beach, 22 summers ago.

He said consistently that he was innocent, that he had not done it. No one believed him, no one but his own family believed him.

And as that case was making its way through the Manitowoc County Circuit Court, just one county over, Teresa Marie Halbach was five and was starting kindergarten. Somewhere else, somewhere we don't know, a man named Gregory

Allen, presumably, was laughing and planning his next violent rape.

Eleven years later, in 1996, Steven

Avery was trying, still, to make people

understand that he was innocent. DNA testing was
in its infancy. It was beginning to move into

courtrooms, out of scientific laboratories. But

we have come a long way, just a few years since

1996, and it was not as advanced as it is today.

But in 1996, Steven Avery took a chance and had blood drawn, a little vial of blood. It was sent off, through the help of his lawyers, for early DNA testing. It couldn't clear him entirely. It helped, but it did not conclusively prove Steven Avery's innocence of the attempted murder and rape on the Manitowoc beach.

And when the tests failed to prove him entirely innocent, that blood was sent back, in a box sealed with evidence tape, to the Manitowoc County Clerk of Court. And there, in 1996, that blood vial, sealed in the box with evidence tape, took up residence in the now 11 year old file of the 1985 case; in a box, in the open, in the Manitowoc County Clerk of Court's Office. And there it sat.

1	And in 1996, here, just a few miles
2	north of here, Teresa Marie Halbach was learning
3	to drive at age 16, I assume. And the irony
4	Could you hear me before? Can you hear
5	me now?
6	THE COURT: We can hear you better now.
7	ATTORNEY STRANG: All right. Is it the
8	Verizon guy who says that?
9	Teresa was learning to drive, I assume,
10	at age 16. And the irony the irony is that
11	the blood vial in the Clerk's Office probably is
12	what ends up in her car, eventually.
13	And time moves forward, though, to 2002.
14	Science also has moved forward. DNA testing has
15	improved, and a new effort is made to exonerate
16	Steven Avery.
17	Now, the blood in the vial, in the box,
18	under the evidence tape, in the Clerk's Office,
19	is not, you will learn, what is used for the 2002
20	and 2003 DNA testing. But, some materials from
21	that box, that file, the overall file from the
22	1985 case, some are sent to the Wisconsin State
23	Crime Laboratory in Madison, to Sherry Culhane,
24	to whom Mr. Kratz introduced you.
25	And the person from the Manitowoc County

Sheriff's Department involved, low these many years later, the department was, but a person from the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department who documented the things that were sent from that old court file to the Crime Laboratory and, therefore, presumably looked at the box and assisted in deciding what to send. That person was, by that time, a lieutenant -- or a detective, now a lieutenant, named James Lenk.

Now, Detective Lenk was with the

Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, had his

office in the Sheriff's Department that adjoins,

or is connected by a small courtyard, to the

Manitowoc County Circuit Court and the Clerk's

Office, by a small courtyard to the south of the

courthouse. He was, as I say, a detective with

the Sheriff's Department. Today he is the

lieutenant of the detectives and leads the

Detective Unit.

He documented, in 2002, what was sent to the State Crime Laboratory from that file. 2002 is the year that Teresa Halbach graduated from the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay and came home a short distance back, here to Calumet County, to start off a promising career.

1 2

3 4 5

In 2003, nearly a year after the necessary DNA samples were sent, the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory was able to establish that Steven Avery did not rape and beat the woman on the Manitowoo beach, as he had been saying all along. And because of the advance of science, the Crime Lab was better -- was able to do better than that. It was able to establish that Gregory Allen did.

Now, unfortunately, in the time that passed, Mr. Allen had raped violently, again, because he had his liberty while that man did his time. But in the fall of 2003, as the weather was cooling, the State of Wisconsin at long last joined Steven Avery in a motion to set aside his conviction, and an innocent man also went home.

Home for Steven Avery, home is the salvage yard of which you have seen, now, many glorious pictures, from up high, from down low, from angles all over. The pictures are a good deal more glorious looking than the salvage yard itself, but this was home. It's the only home that would take him back after this time.

Allen Avery, Steven's father, back there in the working shirt, just as you might expect;

Allen Avery started that business nearly 40 years
ago on the 40 acres that he scrimped to buy. He
raised sons and a daughter. And they didn't

wander far from the business.

Chuck and Earl joined it, Barb works elsewhere, works a factory job, but lives on the property. And this is the sort of business where the family, as you saw, shares the perimeter of this property with the 4,000 rusting, decaying cars that are the refuse, the wreckage of other people's lives.

This is not a glamorous business, but it is a necessary business. It is a good business. And, yes, as you will learn, you have got to get your hands dirty if you're going to be in the salvage business. Not just dirty, you get your hands bloody, because you are working with rusted, jagged metal disassembling cars. And the dirt that grinds into your palms and that you find under your fingernails doesn't wash off at night.

But this was his family's business and this was home. And he rejoined his brother's, Chuck and Earl; and his father, Allen; his mother, Delores, on the family's property and at

the business. He became, again, one in the Avery clan, one man in the Avery clan. And tried to resume some normalcy of life, sharing the perimeter of that salvage yard, not in a pretty house in town, on a nice stone foundation, but in a trailer home, down from his sister's trailer home. Both of them down from the doublewide that mom and dad have, and Chuck's trailer toward the back, on the path toward the crusher.

And it is, although not glamorous, a worthwhile business and it's work with its own dignity. What would we do, if we didn't have the salvage yards in which to find spare parts. I guess we would be reliant entirely on the big corporations that make the cars, to continue to make spare parts for them and sell them at such prices they might see fit.

So it would be pretty tough without the Allen Averys and the Steven Averys of the world. It would be pretty tough for the guy who is restoring the 1968 Pontiac GTO hard top, in his garage, to do that economically. It would be pretty tough for the guy working on a 1965 Mustang convertible, in his spare time, to do that.

Maybe more importantly, it would be pretty tough for the woman who's got young kids to feed, and a job to hold down, and medical bills, and she just has to get another 50,000 miles out of that 1988 Oldsmobile. And for these people, maybe for you, for many of us, it's a good thing that that young woman's father, or brother, or maybe she, can go to the salvage yard and keep the 1988 Oldsmobile running a little while longer.

Now, in 2003, when Steven went home,

Teresa Halbach also was home. Her photography
business was flourishing and things were going
reasonably well. In 2004, Steven Avery filed a
lawsuit seeking some recompense for the hole in
his life, the time he had spent as an innocent
man, for the crimes that Gregory Allen committed.

This was a serious lawsuit. It was in federal court, down in Milwaukee, and there was no question but that a Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department and, in the end, the court system, had gotten the wrong guy.

And as that lawsuit crept forward, as lawsuits do, we came to October 2005. In October 2005, about the middle part of the month, James

Lenk and another ranking officer of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, Sergeant Andrew Colborn, Mr. Lenk and Mr. Colborn both were pulled into the lawsuit, not as defendants or parties to the lawsuit, but as witnesses, witnesses who had their depositions taken in the middle of October, 2005.

Now, a deposition, typically in a civil lawsuit, is an event where you get a subpoena as a witness; you come normally to a lawyer's office, the conference room, the library, the lawyer's office; lawyers from both or all sides are there.

A court reporter is there; these days often a videographer as well. And the court reporter swears the witness under oath, the lawyers ask questions of the witness under oath and they are recorded, much as Mrs. Tesheneck is recording what we're saying here. There's no judge; it happens, as I say, typically in a lawyer's office.

And these two men, Lenk and Colborn, were witnesses. They were witnesses about their own conduct. Neither had been with the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department in 1985, but an event

in 1995 or 1996 came up in that lawsuit. And as to that event, both of them were witnesses being questioned about their own activity and conduct with respect to Mr. Avery's imprisonment.

By the end of that month, unfortunately, those depositions would begin to matter. And indeed, from the time it was filed in 2004, you will learn, the lawsuit itself mattered. This sort of lawsuit, or the public cry of the innocent man wrongly convicted and imprisoned has to be, as you will see here I think, it has to be, as you get into the heads of law enforcement and begin to understand the process of law enforcement, this kind of thing has to be a nightmare for every good law enforcement officer.

These folks do not want to put innocent people in prison. They want to put guilty people in prison. And when they get it wrong, when the whole system gets it wrong, there understandably are feelings of shame, of embarrassment, anger, humiliation, conflicting feelings about this.

This is a good cops worst nightmare,
made all the more worse by the fact that Gregory
Allen, free, thanks to Steven Avery being
convicted instead, Gregory Allen went on to rape

and beat again.

This lawsuit kindled real difficult emotions. And the focal point of those emotions, naturally, was the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department which had investigated the rape many years ago on the Manitowoc beach.

And so when October 31, 2005, Halloween, rolls along, Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn not only have the lawsuit to contemplate, but now, within the last three weeks, have been made witnesses in it and had their depositions taken.

October 31, 2005, began at the Avery
Auto Salvage Yard, much as any workday would.
This was a Monday, the yard was open. Not long
after 8:00 in the morning, about 8:12 in the
morning, Steven Avery called Auto Trader down
in -- actually I think in Hales Corners, Highway
100 down on the southwest side of Milwaukee,
called Auto Trader, as he had done a number of
times before, and said, we need a photographer,
we have a car for sale.

Now, the car belonged to Barb Janda, the van, the mini van you saw computer images of and actual photographs of. It was there. It was hers. It was for sale. I don't expect there

will be any dispute about that. And it was
Barb's to sell. The calls about it were Barb's
to take, the price was Barb's to dicker or
negotiate with people interested in making an
offer, on the used van.

Steve left B. Janda as the name because that was the name of the seller. But Barb works during the day at a factory in town. She does not work at the salvage yard as Steven did. He leaves her telephone number because that's where the phone calls have to go if there's an interested buyer.

And this, you will find out, is not at all unusual or sinister. It doesn't involve luring anyone anywhere. There was a car for sale. There were photographs to be taken. And, indeed, on that day alone, for Teresa Halbach, with the three appointments we know about; this was not the only appointment where the seller of the car was not the person whose name was given to Auto Trader.

The Schmitz car was called in by and listed as an appointment for a Craig Sippel (phonetic). And that little bit of confusion was quickly cleared up by the police. Wasn't really

Sippel's car; it was Schmitz's car, no big deal.

But she thought she was going to see a Craig

Sippel, not a Steven Schmitz.

B. Janda, I suppose, not a Steven Avery. But here's what she knew, she knew the address. Steven gave the address. This is an address, as Mr. Kratz explained to you and I agree, to which Teresa Halbach had been a number of times, probably about a half dozen, five, six, maybe more times, to take photographs of cars or the trailer for sale, for example, the photograph you saw.

She knows the address. She knows where she's going. As you will see, this is not a surprise, or a secret to her or to anyone else.

And at 11:45 that morning, she called Barb

Janda's number and evidently left a voice mail message saying that she would be able to get there that day, sometime after 2:00.

Now, this Manitowoc County area was

Teresa's territory so to speak, for Auto Trader.

This was her freelance work as I understand, not her main source of income. Her photography

studio work I think probably was her passion and

this was a side job for a young photographer to generate some more money.

She has a territory for Auto Trader.

Steven Avery wouldn't necessarily know what her territory is or whether she's the only photographer working it. And sometime close to 2:30, he's obviously getting fidgety. He makes two phone calls to her cell phone from his cell phone and he uses the *67 feature, you will find out, which as I understand it on the -- on Teresa's telephone, then, no telephone number would come up; come up is unavailable, or something like that, or blocked.

But he is on his own cell phone and he may not want, not being entirely sure whose number he is calling, he may not want to be giving out his cell phone number. At least the second of those calls goes unanswered.

And the time frame gets fuzzy here.

Mr. Kratz said that it was late afternoon that

Teresa arrived and I'm inclined to agree with

that; although it is difficult to nail down. But

I think the best evidence you will hear is that

although Teresa Halbach is in the neighborhood of

the Zipperers, who are really just -- I don't

know how far, but not too far down Highway 147 and then south toward Manitowoc a little bit. So they are in the general vicinity.

And I think at about 2:15 she's near the Zipperers, trying to figure out exactly where she's going to get to the Zipperers to take that photograph of their car. But I think the best -- the best estimate we'll get out of the evidence of when she actually arrives at Avery Road, which is that gravel road that leads down towards, first, Barb Janda's trailer and then Steven Avery's trailer, which you saw on the north edge of the 40 acre parcel; the best estimate of when she swings her Toyota down that gravel road is probably shortly before 3:30, probably not 2:45, as one of Barb Janda's sons, Bobby Dassey, recalls it.

Why do I say the best estimate, because there is a school bus driver. Two of Barb Janda's boys, Brendan and Blaine, are still in Mishicot High School and it's Monday, as I said. And they ride the school bus. And school schedules being what they are, of course, unless there is really terrible weather or something, school lets out at the exact same time every day,

the bell rings and kids run out the door.

The bus is going to be leaving about the same time and the bus driver will be driving the same route every day. So this bus driver, who's no relation to the Avery family, or the Halbachs, or anybody else for that matter, just happens to be the school bus driver; her name is Lisa Buchner.

Lisa Buchner, when interviewed by the police says, you know, about 3:30 when I dropped the Dassey boys off at the head of Avery Road, I looked down the road and I saw a young woman taking a photograph, or photographs, of a van.

Now, Buchner actually isn't sure when she's questioned about this whether it's Monday,

Tuesday, or Wednesday of that week.

But Monday is the day that a young woman would have been taking a photograph of the van, down near the end of Avery Road. So she's got a pretty good reason to have a good bead on the time. She's going to know her route, this is something she's doing five days a week. And it's about 3:30 that she sees this young woman down the road, taking a photograph of the van.

Teresa Halbach does her business. And

the way this works is the person selling the car then gives the photographer \$40. The photographer makes out a receipt for the transaction, typically also offers the customer the current copy, current edition of the Auto Trader Magazine and leaves.

And that's what Teresa Halbach did.

Steven Avery last sees her going back out Avery

Road and about to turn left to go back out to

Highway 147.

Now, somebody clearly sees her later. We don't know who, I don't know where, I don't know when. And I, like Mr. Kratz, don't know why.

I do know this and can tell you that you will hear this about the evidence. One of the things that the photographers who freelance or work for Auto Trader do, is to go take photographs on appointments that have been set for them through the Auto Trader office.

But there is another thing they can do, they get some money for that, obviously. Some of the \$40 goes to the photograph. But there's another thing they can do and that's called a hustle shot. The hustle shot is exactly that,

it's business that the photographer hustles up for herself, or for himself.

And as an incentive for the photographer, to hustle a little bit and, you know, thicken the Auto Trader Magazine with new customers selling cars, or boats, or trailers, or whatever, as an incentive for their photographers to do that, Auto Trader gives the photographer a little bigger cut on a hustle shot.

You are going to learn that Teresa
Halbach was good at hustle shots. She drummed up
a lot of these. She was likeable. She was hard
working. She was good at getting hustle shots.

I have no idea -- I have no idea at all and I don't think you will either, unfortunately, whether she had a hustle shot, or two, or three, that day or not. It would not have been uncommon. But if, in fact, she's near the Zipperers at 2:15 and as I think is probable from the evidence, she doesn't show up to the Averys until about 3:30, it's possible there's a hustle shot in there or I suppose stopping for lunch or something, we don't know.

It's possible there are hustle shots that are not scheduled through Auto Trader after

the Avery shot. Because after all, I mean, if
we're at 3:30, there's a good bit of daylight
left in the working day, I suppose. But we don't
know.

What we do know is that someone sees her later. And Steven Avery calls her later, as a matter of fact, from his cell phone. Again, he calls her cell phone at about 4:35 that afternoon. Why, because he thought, I have got another car I would like to sell. I might as well, if she's still around, or if she can swing back, I might as well have her shoot that one too.

But he doesn't get an answer from her, doesn't answer the phone, when he calls at 4:35. He sticks around. And at that point his girlfriend, Jodi Stachowski, is in jail serving some time for a drunk driving conviction. She's in the Manitowoc County Jail.

Jodi, you will learn, calls Steven regularly. Because she's in jail, she has to call collect. And you can't call collect from a jail to a cell phone. I don't know if you can call collect to any cell phone from anywhere.

But in any event, you can't call a cell phone

from the jail, calling collect. So you have got to call a land line.

So that's exactly what Jodi Stachowski does, first a little bit after 5:30 in the evening she calls. And jail systems, I don't know if you know this, but jail systems, typically, and the Manitowoc County Jail clearly does this, cut off phone calls after 15 minutes. Inmates have a lot of time on their hands, sometimes people they are calling don't. So the call just ends at 15 minutes.

So Jodi calls about a little bit after 5:30 on the land line. And then she calls again just shortly before 9:00 p.m. And Steven is home. Steven answers the phone in his little red trailer there, both times. And both of those conversations go 15 minutes, almost to the second.

He tells her that he's been doing a little cleaning. He tells her that Brendan, his nephew, Brendan Dassey, is over. They hassle. These are inane conversations, honestly, but they are tape recorded, because every phone call out of the jail is tape recorded, so we know they happen.

Does it sound like he's just killed someone, no. Does he hide the fact that his nephew, Brendan, from 50 yards away, or whatever it is, Barb's trailer, has come over, no.

Doesn't have to tell Jodi that, if they were up to something no good, but he does. Brendan is around.

And for all the world, as I say, these conversations simply are inane, they don't ring of someone who has committed a murder or in the midst of committing a murder, or in the midst of mutilating a corpse or falsely imprisoning anyone, no screaming in the background. They are just inane telephone conversations between a squabbling boyfriend and a squabbling girlfriend.

And October 31 comes to a close. It's about three days later, Thursday evening about 5:00, November 3, when Mrs. Halbach reports
Teresa missing. Teresa lives almost next door to the elder Halbachs; I mean, the two houses, you can see the one from the other, on the dairy farm, up north of here, in Calumet County.

So the report goes to the Calumet County
Sheriff's Department. It's a missing person
report. No one has seen Teresa since Sunday,

actually. And the Calumet County Sheriff's office responds, interviews the family, a couple of close friends, and learns very quickly about these three appointments that Teresa had on Monday. Now, at least two of those -- at least two, maybe the third even, but at least two, are in Manitowoc County; Zipperers and Avery, or B. Janda.

So the Calumet County Sheriff's

Department calls for help from the Manitowoc

County Sheriff's Department on this missing

person report; that very night, 5:00, the report

is made. By the end the of the dinner hour,

Calumet County is calling the Manitowoc County

Sheriff's Department for a little bit of help.

And who do we get? We get Sergeant

Andrew Colborn. And he's told, look, two places
we would like to sort of check out and see if
Teresa Halbach showed up on Monday, the Zipperer
residence and Steven Avery. Well, that's a name
that rings a bell, you better believe; less than
three weeks, or about three weeks, after his
deposition.

And it is interesting that of those two places that Sergeant Colborn is asked to check

out and inquire after Teresa Halbach, he only goes to one. He goes to Steven Avery's home and Steven cooperates with him. Tells him essentially what I have told you about Teresa Halbach coming to take the picture of Barb Janda's van. Doesn't clam up, doesn't seem nervous, isn't uncooperative; that very night, November 3, around 7:00, when Sergeant Colborn knocks on his door.

Out of the blue, the same night,
Lieutenant James Lenk, now the head of the
Detective Unit in Manitowoc County Sheriff's
Department, calls Calumet about this missing
person report. Now, at this time, on Thursday
night, November 3, this is -- let's be clear,
this is just a missing person report, a young
woman who hasn't been seen for three days.

Manitowoc County at all. And nobody has called for Lieutenant Lenk. And nobody's called looking for him. But the chief detective of Manitowoc County takes it upon himself, that night, to call Calumet and offer to get involved in the missing person investigation where one of the appointments that was to be kept was Steven

Avery.

And the next morning, Lieutenant Lenk does one better than that, he goes out himself to Steven Avery's trailer with another officer from Manitowoc. And he knocks on the door again, just as Sergeant Colborn had done the night before, inquiring after Teresa Halbach. Again, Steven Avery is cooperative.

Lieutenant Lenk asks, could I take a walk through your trailer, can I look around, do you mind? No, I don't mind. Come on in.

Lieutenant Lenk walks through Steven's trailer, sees nothing amiss, thanks him for his cooperation and leaves.

November 5, Saturday, Steven has left to go to the family cabin up in Crivitz, early that morning, where Allen goes every weekend and most of the family goes up too. Steven has gone up on Saturday morning. But about 10:30 on Saturday morning, Pam and Nikole Sturm find the Toyota they suspect, correctly, as it turns out, is Teresa's. As it turns out, is Teresa's, in the far diagonal corner of the salvage yard from Steven Avery's trailer.

As you might expect, law enforcement

officers descend on the property and the first to arrive are Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department officers at just about 11:00, in the morning, on the nose. And, folks, from that point forward, from 11:00 a.m. on Saturday, November 5, 2005, this is not so much a funnel approach, as you will see. It is a tunnel approach. It is a tunnel vision approach to this case.

All of the feelings about Steven Avery, all of those churning emotions, all of that, within the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, floods out. You can call it tunnel vision, you can call it investigative bias, but from that point on, this investigation is about Steven Avery and not much else.

From 11:00 in the morning on Saturday,

November 5, 2005, before the police say they have

even opened the car; before they say they know of

any blood of any sort in or on the car; before

anybody even knows whether this young woman has

been hurt or killed, the focus is on Steven

Avery.

Other people are asked, her male roommate; former boyfriend and current friend, Ryan Hillegas; others are asked: Do you know

anything about her disappearance? Did you have anything to do with it? All of them say no. And those denials, those statements are accepted.

Not Steven Averys, not Steven Avery's denials or expressions of innocence. Time and again the police go back to Steven Avery and ask the same questions. And he talks to them every time.

Even by the time his lawyers in the civil lawsuit down in federal court in Milwaukee find out about it and are trying to encourage him not to the talk to the police, he talks. On the 3rd to Colborn, on the 4th to Lenk, on the 5th to officers up in Crivitz, on the 6th, on the 9th, he talks. And he is not believed. Do they want to go through his house, sure, come on in my house, on November 4, Lieutenant Lenk.

After the Toyota is found and the police arrive at about 11:00, that Saturday morning, Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn come in to work and they too arrive at the Avery property. You will hear that Lieutenant Lenk now has changed his sworn version of when he arrived that afternoon.

And he has the ability to change his

sworn story about when he arrived that afternoon at the Avery property, because somehow he avoided signing in on the log, the log sheets that the Calumet County Sheriff's Department was keeping of that potential crime scene. He signed out, but somehow he managed not to sign in.

And on that 40 acre parcel, after the Toyota has been turned over to the Division of Criminal Investigation in Madison, now, as search efforts are to be begin on that parcel, now the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department nominally turns over control of the investigation to Sheriff Jerry Pagel of the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, this county's sheriff's department. Nominally, that afternoon, control of this investigation was turned over to Calumet from Manitowoc because of the apparent conflict of interest that Mr. Avery's lawsuit represents for the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department.

Now, if you are thinking, though, that the evidence will show you that Manitowoc County bowed out because of the conflict of interest after it turned the investigation over to Calumet County; if you are thinking that, it's reasonable, but you are wrong. Manitowoc County

Sheriff's Department stays very much involved in this investigation.

And what does Lieutenant Lenk and what does Sergeant Colborn do by way of volunteering to help, that very afternoon, Saturday

November 5. Do they volunteer to help look in the 4,000 cars? No. Do they volunteer to search Allen and Delores Avery's home? No. How about the pole barns or the outbuildings of the salvage property's business itself? No. They volunteer to search Steven Avery's trailer. And they do, on November 5.

And once they get into that trailer with the search warrant, well, then, what these two do -- and there are two other officers with them, one from Manitowoc and one from Calumet -- what Lenk and Colborn do is, they say, don't worry, we'll take Steven's bedroom. And they search this bedroom.

Now, this is a mobile home. If the bedroom itself is 10 by 12, or 12 by 12, or 10 by 10, I would be surprised if it was much bigger than that. From me to the wall in front of you is about the depth and roughly the width of that bedroom in the small trailer in which Steven

Avery lives.

They search, that is, Lenk and Colborn search his bedroom on the night of November 5.

And they find nothing of interest. They see the guns; they stay on the wall. But don't bother seizing guns on the 5th, come back to those the next day. And it is Lenk and Colborn who come back the next day, not somewhere on the property, but to Steven Avery's trailer.

On November 6, they search his garage, garage is actually between him and his sister

Barb's trailer, but for our purpose here, let's call it his garage. You will find out that the Dassey boys have access to the garage, Barb has access, the family has access to this garage.

But it's Lenk and Colborn and another detective from Manitowoc County named Dave Remiker who searched the garage on Sunday, the 6th. They find 10, maybe it's 11, something, 10 or 11 spent .22 casings. And they pick all of those up.

But remember -- remember the bullet that's found under little tent number 9 on the picture that Mr. Kratz showed you? The bullet that's apparently in a crack in the floor, right

smack in the middle of the garage near the front
where the door is? That, no one sees or picks up
on November 6th, November 7th, November 8th and
so forth through November 12th.

Neither does anyone see a bullet back under the air compressor. But you will see photographs of that garage as it was in November 2005, not as it was in March, 2006, when, finally, low and behold, why there's bullets, why don't we pick up these bullets.

You will see the garage in photographs, not computer simulations, photographs, as it was in November, 2005. You will be able to see, that although the garage is very cluttered, there's no clutter under the air compressor. There's no clutter there, where four months later someone finds a magic bullet, there, as you walk into the garage, looking at the floor.

November 7, Steven Avery's trailer is searched again, guess who; Lenk and Colborn. Now there probably -- There certainly are over 50 law enforcement officers on this property, 24 hours a day, well before November 7th, probably by sometime late the night of the 5th, certainly by the 6th. There may be over 100 law enforcement

officers working this property.

They have got the family excluded. They have got a perimeter around the entire 40 acres and more. They are controlling traffic and entry. They are logging in who comes and goes. They control this place.

And as you heard Mr. Kratz say, they
have got any number of people searching, but it's
Lenk and Colborn, again, who are searching
Mr. Avery's trailer, there in the northwest
corner of that salvage yard. And on November
7th, they find nothing of interest in his home.

Tuesday, November 8, they are back.

They are back in Mr. Avery's home, back in that small bedroom. And now, Lieutenant Lenk, on what you will hear is probably the seventh search of that small bedroom, Lieutenant Lenk, now, when he's the only one in that room, says, why, my gosh, there's a key sitting in plain view, next to the night stand.

There is, you saw a picture of it as he says he found it, one solitary key on a ring, connected to a fob. That key fob is just like, and probably is, the one that Teresa Halbach's younger sister bought her as a little present.

One key, and one key only, on the ring connected to that fob, it's a Toyota key.

And the man whom the State would have you believe bled all over Teresa's car, manages not to bleed on her key. His blood isn't found there, although, apparently, somehow his DNA is, but not his fingerprints. And more interestingly, although this is a 1999 Toyota and I gather she's been using this key, the State believes, every day to start her car and turn it off, Teresa Halbach's DNA and fingerprints are not found on her key.

For good measure, on November 8,
Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn searched
Steven Avery's garage yet again. No bullets, no
nothing. And the case against Steven Avery,
largely, is made at that point. And a whole lot
of it, as you will see, depends on lieutenant
James Lenk, Sergeant Andy Colborn.

And they, both of them, have elected never to tell Sheriff Jerry Pagel, the man in charge of the investigation for Calumet County; they have elected not to tell him that they had their depositions taken in Steven Avery's case probably three weeks earlier. They didn't tell

anybody in the Calumet County Sheriff's Department that.

November 8 is also the day that the bone fragments are found in a burn area hardly 20 yards outside Steven Avery's master bedroom window. Hardly 20 yards. Small burnt bone fragments, human burnt bone fragments. But what you will learn and you do not hear this morning, what you will learn is that burnt human bone fragments also apparently are found in one of the burn barrels behind Barb Janda's house.

Burnt the same way, fragmented about the same way, and apparently human in origin. Not Steven Avery's burn barrel, not the one you heard about, but there are four burn barrels to the southeast, that is the most distant corner of Barb Janda's trailer, from Steven Avery's trailer. Four burn barrels back there for Barb Janda and the Dassey boys. Burnt bone fragments.

And there are what seem to be probable human burnt fragmented bones found in the Radandt Gravel Quarry, probably a quarter mile south of Steven Avery's property.

Now, I don't think that the State has been able to link, through DNA analysis, those

burnt bone fragments conclusively to Teresa Halbach.

But how many burnt human bone fragments are there supposed to be, and when you only have one person missing. And the burnt human bone fragments in the Janda burn barrel, about which you did not hear this morning, those are fragments from bones that are not connected, not part of one limb, not connected to one another within the human body. Sort of a random mix of bone fragments, as apparently are those that are found a quarter mile to the south in the Radandt gravel pit.

And as you piece this evidence together, here's what you are going to have to conclude, bone fragments, parts of this body were found where they were not burned. They were burned and moved because, again, the fragments aren't connected to one another.

It's not that, you know, it's not that an arm could have been removed and burned one place and the rest of the body another place. We have got the fragments themselves mixed up and found in three different places. The body couldn't have been burned in that way, in three

different places or even two, if you set aside the Radandt gravel pit. These bone fragments were moved.

The question then becomes, the question you will have to decide eventually is, were they moved from Steven Avery's burn area to the Janda burn barrel or the gravel quarry, or were they moved from somewhere else to Steven Avery's burn area and maybe to one of the other places where bone fragments, burnt, are found.

At least, did they start in the burn area and get moved somewhere else, or did they start somewhere else, burned somewhere else and get moved to the burn area. Now, an expert -- experts here, in what scientists will call thermal injuries to bodies, cremation, an expert or two, to the extent you hear that, may be able to give you some help on that question, some help, but I'm not sure that an expert can answer this conclusively.

In the end, you folks are going to have to do the hard work and the hard thinking on that. But I think when you have heard it all, you will conclude that it's at least most likely, more probable, that the bones were moved to

Steven Avery's burn area, not burned there and moved from that area to another place or two.

Why? You are going to find out that there are better places, even on the Avery salvage yard property, in which to incinerate a body. The burn area is relatively flat and scooped out a little bit, but it's relatively flat and open. It's a burn area, like many farms or rural homes have, just folks have burn barrels.

It doesn't have well developed sides to focus heat back inward on the fuel or things being burned. Neither does it have a ready external source of fuel. But the aluminum smelter, the aluminum smelter at the Avery Auto Salvage property does. Big propane jets, an enclosed area, it will take an aluminum transmission down to liquid in a few minutes.

The wood furnace that heats the outbuildings of the Avery Auto Salvage business; Chuck's home; Allen and Delores' home, that's an enclosed area that will incinerate fuel in it very quickly.

And because we have got probable human burnt bone fragments found on the adjoining

property, the gravel quarry to the south, we can't rule out other possible burn sites. And an expert won't be able to tell you what other possible burn sites there are. Expert or not, that's not something he or she will be able to tell you.

But once it's more likely, as I think
you will find it to be more likely, that the body
is burned somewhere else and bone fragments then
are brought to Steven Avery's burn area, then
he's not guilty. Because if he's the one who
burned the body somewhere else, he's not going to
bring the bones back to dump them 20 yards
outside his bedroom window.

Neither is he going to dump a cell phone and a digital camera and a palm pilot in his own burn barrel. Too many other places where these things could be disposed of out in the salvage yard, whether the retention pond, whether the gravel quarry, or some other burn barrel in the woods. So once you understand that those bones probably were not burned in that burn area, the fact that they are found there, you will see tends to suggest he's not guilty, not that he is.

It is perfectly clear to anyone around

this investigation on whom the focus of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department and the other investigators, to the extent that tunnel vision, that investigative bias bled over, it's perfectly clear on whom the focus of this investigation is.

The police didn't kill Teresa Halbach, obviously, they have that in common with Steven Avery, but they wanted to believe he did. They very much wanted to believe that he did. And whoever did kill her, or burned that body, exploited that tunnel vision pretty skillful.

Suggesting this sort of tunnel vision, suggesting this kind of investigative bias, planting blood in her car, fairly serious allegations to make. In fact, I will take away the fairly, they are serious allegations.

Understand them, that bias and tunnel vision are human anomalies.

And if you conclude, reluctantly, that Mr. Lenk or Mr. Colborn, in addition to all the other interests they took in searching and focusing on Steven Avery, planted blood in her car, you will also conclude that they put it there because they figured it had to be there.

It should be there. It must be him.

This wasn't so much, I think the
evidence will show you, an effort to frame an
innocent man, it was an intense, intense desire
to conclude that he, in fact, was the guilty man;
all other possible leads for information not
withstanding. It was an immediate focus on this
man, starting shortly after 11:00, Saturday,
November 5, 2005. But you do not have to take my
word for that.

I can make this work; I'm not as adept at it as I should be. I'm going to play for you, two tapes, a part of it, just excerpts, short excerpts of two tapes.

The first one is Saturday, November 5, 2005, at 11:35 in the morning, 35 minutes give or take a minute or two, after the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department first has arrived at the Avery property, because that Toyota has been found; well before the police say they opened the Toyota; well before they say they knew of any blood; well before Brutus, the friendly cadaver dog comes along and hits; 35 minutes after the first officers arrived when the Sturm's called and said, hey, we think we found something.

What I'm going to do is scroll through a transcript that we prepared and then I will play the excerpt of the tape for you. It is not a great recording. The transcript is not evidence, the tape will be, I expect. So if you think my transcript is wrong, listen to the tape; it's the evidence, or it will be. That's the tape that matters. The transcript may help you in understanding it or hearing it.

-1

Detective Remiker is calling in, he's asking for dispatch. Dispatch responds, I put unintelligible, I think it's go ahead, but I'm not sure, you can decide. Maybe you won't understand it for sure either.

Detective Remiker says to the dispatcher, you will need to get ahold of the Crime Lab for their evidence response team to start responding to this location. Now, he's out at the Avery Salvage Yard. As you will hear. Dispatch says, 10-4, Crime Lab out of Madison, Milwaukee, where?

Our Crime Lab has branches in Wausau,
Madison and Milwaukee. The main one is in
Madison. Detective Remiker says, it's going to
be the Madison response team and he was right.

1	Now, Detective Jacobs joins in, this
2	radio traffic, radio conversation. Calls in with
3	his badge number, his squad number, I'm in code,
4	you will find out what that means, anything you
5	need other than a portable for Schetter. And
6	what you'll find out is he's talking about a
7	portable radio for Deputy Inspector Greg Schetter
8	of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department who
9	is, I think, the number two or three ranking
10	officer in the Department and who's probably also
11	going out to the Avery property. Detective
12	Remiker, not that I can think of right now,
13	Dennis. Dennis Jacobs. Let's see if this work.
14	(Tape recording played.)
15	DETECTIVE REMIKER: Yeah, need to get a
16	hold of the Crime Lab for their evidence response
17	to start responding at this location.
18	DISPATCH: 10-4. Crime Lab out of
19	Madison, Milwaukee, where?
20	DETECTIVE REMIKER: Madison response
21	team.
22	DETECTIVE JACOBS: 278, I'm in code,
23	anything you need other than a portable for
24	Schetter.
25	ATTORNEY STRANG. It gut off Sorry about

that, you will hear -- You will get a chance to hear 1 the whole conversation. And it continues, Dennis 2 Jacobs says, okay, other than the car, do we have 3 anything else. He's talking to Remiker here. Dave 4 Remiker says, not yet. Detective Jacobs, Okay. Is 5 he in custody? Detective Remiker, Negative, nothing 5 7 yet. Not who, not is who in custody, but 8 negative. He is not in custody, nothing yet. 9 Detective Jacobs, Okay. I'll gather my stuff and 10 11 head out. 12 (Tape recording played.) 13 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Okay. Other than the 14 car do we have anything else? 15 DETECTIVE REMIKER: Not yet. 16 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Is he in custody? 17 DETECTIVE REMIKER: Not yet, nothing 18 happening. 19 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Okay. I will gather 20 my stuff and head out. 21 ATTORNEY STRANG: Now, that's 11:35, is he 22 in custody yet. Detective Remiker, clearly, I 23 gather, as I hear it, knows who Detective Jacobs is 24 talking about, but we don't, 35 minutes after the

police have arrived.

And to get a better feel for that 1 conversation at 11:35, we have to go back five 2 minutes earlier when Detective Jacobs is calling 3 in on the land line, 5 minutes earlier, 30 4 minutes, 30 minutes after the police have arrived 5 at the Avery property after Teresa's car has been 6 found there. 7 Dispatcher answers the phone. Detective 8 Jacobs, Katie -- the name of the dispatcher --9 just rolled into the parking lot. Can you tell 10 11

me, do we have a body or anything yet? Do we have a body or anything yet? This is 30 minutes after they found the car.

I don't believe so. I believe they wouldn't find the first bone fragment for three days. Do we have Steven Avery in custody, though? I have no idea. You can hear it yourself.

(Tape recording played.)

DISPATCH: Good morning. Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, Katie speaking.

DETECTIVE JACOBS: Katie, I just rolled into the parking lot. Can you tell me, do we have a body or anything yet?

DISPATCH: I don't believe so.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	DETECTIVE JACOBS: Do we have Steven
2	Avery in custody?
3	(Tape recording starts playing again.)
4	DISPATCH: Good morning. Manitowoc
5	County Sheriff's Department, Katie speaking.
6	DETECTIVE JACOBS: Katie, I just rolled
7	into the parking lot, can you tell me do we have
8	a body or anything yet?
9	DISPATCH: I don't believe so.
10	DETECTIVE JACOBS: Do we have Steven
11	Avery in custody at all?
12	DISPATCH: I have no idea.
13	ATTORNEY STRANG: Now, I will finish it out
14	so you can link it up to the call the discussion
15	with Detective Remiker 5 minutes later. Oh, I heard
16	him say pick up that party. Oh no, the dispatcher
17	says, Pete, who is just another Manitowoc County
18	Sheriff's officer, is sitting up there waiting and
19	stopping people from going in and that. He found
20	someone with a body only warrant for our department.
21	A body only warrant is an arrest warrant
22	or a bench warrant where they are going to take
23	the person into custody, rather than immediately
24	grant him bail. Okay. Do we have All right.

I will talk to Remiker. Yeah, your best bet is

to talk -- because nothing has come through. We 1 have the vehicle, that I know. But more than 2 that, I don't know. All right. Bye. Bye. 3 (Tape recording played.) 4 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Oh, I heard him say 5 pick up that party. 6 DISPATCH: Oh, no. We have -- Well, 7 Pete is sitting up there waiting and stopping 8 people from going in and that. He found somebody 9 with a body only warrant for our department. 10 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Okay. Do we have --11 All right. I will talk to Remiker. 12 DISPATCH: Yeah, your best bet is to 13 talk to -- Nothing has come through. We have the 14 vehicle, that I know. 15 DETECTIVE JACOBS: All right. Thank 16 you. 17 DISPATCH: But what more, I don't know. 18 All right. Bye. 19 DETECTIVE JACOBS: Bye. 20 ATTORNEY STRANG: So you can take the 21 tunnel vision and investigative bias from them, not 22 from me. Now, in the end here, in the end, when you 23 have heard it all, there's not a speck of Teresa 24 Halbach's blood anywhere in Steven Avery's trailer.

There's not a piece of hair, nothing, nothing to suggest she's ever been in the trailer. And only the magic bullet found 4 months later to suggest she's ever been anywhere near the garage.

And when you consider the forces, the emotions, the very human failings at work here, it's no surprise that the blood from that unsecured vial, in the box, in the Clerk's Office, that Lieutenant Lenk examined back in 2002, ends up in that Toyota. Because that's where it ought to be. Is he in custody yet?

Jerome Buting and I will not ask you to make that kind of snap judgment here. The Halbachs deserve better than that. The police deserve better than that. You owe it to yourselves, in making this decision, to do better than a snap judgment, a snap judgment 30 minutes after that Toyota is found.

Jerome Buting and I are going to ask you to do your job right. Think long and hard about all of the evidence. But in the end, after the full and fair consideration of everything and everyone, the full and fair consideration that Steven Avery did not get in 2005, from the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department; we're

going to ask you to send him home. We're going 1 to ask you to send him home, again. We're going 2 to ask you to get it right this time. We're 3 going to ask you to set it right when this case 4 is over. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Strang. Members 6 of the jury, we're going to take an afternoon break 7 now. We'll resume in 15 minutes and the State will 8 begin the presentation of evidence. I will remind 9 you again, as I will a number of times throughout 10 the trial, do not discuss the case during the break 11 or at any other time until all the evidence has been 12 received. 13 (Jury not present.) 14 THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we should 15 be ready to go promptly at 2:45. 16 (Recess taken.) 17 THE COURT: At this time the State may call 18 its first witness. 19 ATTORNEY KRATZ: State will call Mike 20 Halbach, your Honor. 21 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. 22 MICHAEL D. HALBACH, called as a witness 23 herein, having been first duly sworn, was 24 examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state 1 2 your name and spell your last name for the record. THE WITNESS: Michael Daniel Halbach, 3 4 H-a-l-b-a-c-h. 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY ATTORNEY KRATZ: 7 Mr. Halbach, did you know a young woman by the 8 name of Teresa Halbach? 9 A. I did. 10 0. Describe, who was Teresa, please. 11 A. Teresa was -- or is my sister. She was born on March 22nd, 1980. Grew up with my family on a 12 13 dairy farm near Hilbert. 14 She loved travel; she had been to Spain, 15 Mexico, New Zealand, Australia. 16 She had many friends. She loved doing 17 things with her friends. She was a good friend 18 of mine, as well. 19 She was my big sister, someone I could 20 go to talk to about any problems I would have. 21 We would go to lunch, talk about her business 22 which she ran, called Photography by Teresa. 23 And in August of 2005, she coached her 24 sister's 7th grade volleyball team to second 25 place in their league. So I know that that's

something she really loved doing, was working 1 with those kids. That was the main focus of her 2 3 photography business as well. And she graduated from the University of 4 Wisconsin, Green Bay, in 2002, major in 5 photography and she graduated summa cum laude. 6 I'm going to hand you a couple of exhibits. 7 Q. First exhibit is that which is marked as Exhibit 8 No. 1. Could you tell us what that is, please. 9 10 It's a photo of Teresa. A. 11 Do you know when that photo was taken? Q. 12 A. Not exactly, but by the looks of it, it was 13 fairly recent. I would say 2005. 14 Does that particular photo accurately depict your 0. sister, Teresa, and as it did the last time that 15 16 you saw her? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. By the way, when was the last time that you saw 19 her; do you recall? 20 A. The last time I saw my sister was October 30th, 21 2005, the day before she went missing. We were 22 at my grandparents house. It was my grandpa's --23 Halloween was my grandpa's birthday. And the day 24 before we went to their house, the entire family

was there, aunts, uncles.

1 Mr. Halbach, I'm sure we'll get better at this 2 with the jury, but I'm going to direct your attention to the large screen in the courtroom, 3 4 is that another version or a larger version of what's been marked as Exhibit No. 1? 5 6 A. Yes, it is. You mentioned that Teresa was part of your 7 0. family, can you tell us who else was involved in 8 9 your immediate family, please? A. 10 I have an older brother, Tim; and then Teresa 11 would be the second oldest; myself; and two 12 younger sisters, Katie and Kelly; parents, Tom 13 and Karen. 14 Q. Directing your attention to Exhibit No. 2, I'm 15 also putting that on the screen for the jury; can 16 you tell us what that is, please. 17 A. It's a photo we took outside my parents farm. I 18 believe it was in 2004, that summer, early fall. 19 It's a photo we used for our Christmas cards that 20 year. And it's a photo of my family. 21 Q. And as you are pointing to Exhibit No. 2, please, could you tell us, or tell the jury, who all is 22 23 in that photo? 24 A. Tom, Teresa's, I guess legally would be her step

dad, standing in the back with the jean shirt; to

1 his left is, Katie, younger sister; and to her left is Kelly, the youngest of the family. In 2 3 front from left to right is the oldest brother, Tim; and then my mom, Karen; then myself holding 4 5 our dog, Eddy; and Teresa is on the end. 6 0. All right. How often would you get to see 7 Teresa; how often would you interact with her? Every few days I would probably talk to her 8 either on the phone, or if it was a weekend, we 9 would probably see each other, if I was at my 10 11 parent's house if she would stop over during the week, or over the weekend. So I would see her --12 see her or at least talk to her every three days 13 14 or so. 15 Q. Are you familiar with Teresa's electronic devices 16 that she owned? 17 A. Yes, I am. 18 0. Could you tell us about those, please. 19 A. She owned a cell phone, a Motorola RAZR, and I 20 know this because she talked on it a lot. She 21 also had a palm pilot. I believe it was -- the 22 brand was Palm 1, I believe. 23 She had tons of photography equipment, obviously. Hasselblad is one camera; Canon is 24

another; and through one of her jobs she had a

little snapshot camera for the job. She worked 1 2 through Auto Trader Magazine. She had this little snapshot camera to do that job. 3 Do you know what kind of vehicle Teresa drove? 4 0. It was a Toyota RAV4. It was bluish-green in 5 A. 6 color. We're going to have the actual photo marked as an 7 0. exhibit, but I'm going to direct your attention 8 up to the large screen. Could you tell us what 9 10 it is we're looking at there. 11 Could you repeat that. Sure, I'm about to have this photo made part of 12 Q. 13 the -- or to complete the record, but could you 14 tell us and can you look at the large screen and 15 tell us what it is that we're looking at. 16 That's Teresa holding one of her cameras she had 17 with her professional photography business, 18 standing outside the driver's side door of her 19 Toyota RAV4. 20 Q. Mr. Halbach, could you -- regarding Teresa's 21 RAV4, could you tell us how often you had contact 22 with that vehicle? 23 A. I would say I have ridden in it a few times, but 24 I would see it whenever I saw her. It was her 25 only vehicle, so when she would drive it or when

she would drive around, she would be in that 1 vehicle. So I was very familiar with it and had 2 3 ridden in it a few times. Teresa's license plate said -- as you sit here 4 5 today, did you know or were you familiar with 6 what Teresa's license plates were? 7 A. Yes, I was. And how are you familiar with that? 8 Q. One of Teresa's jokes and how she remembered her 9 A. license plate, her license plate numbers -- or 10 11 letters and numbers were SWH-582. She remembered 12 those letters because she would joke that it 13 stood for single white Halbach. (Exhibits No. 3 & 4 marked for identification.) 14 15 Q. Mr. Halbach, I provided you with two exhibits 16 Exhibit No. 3 and Exhibit No. 4, can you tell us, 17 though, what those are, please? 18 A. Pictures of Teresa's license plate. 19 Q. And which one of them has the sticker on it. 20 Exhibit No. 3. A. 21 Q. All right. Just so the jury is shown Exhibit 22 No. 3, I'm going to direct your attention to the 23 large screen, again; what is it that we're 24 looking at?

Teresa's license plate?

25

A.

SWH-582, is that right? 1 Q. 2 That's correct. A. THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Kratz, just for 3 the record, I think the photo of Teresa Halbach with 4 the RAV4 was referred to as an exhibit, but we 5 haven't marked it yet; are you still looking for the 6 7 original? ATTORNEY KRATZ: We are, Judge. Although 8 we have the original, Judge, we'll be referring to 9 it either with this witness or the next witness who 10 also has familiarity with that. 11 THE COURT: Just, I think, to keep the 12 record straight, it should be reflected that while 13 it may have been referred to as an expected exhibit 14 number, it has yet to be numbered. 15 ATTORNEY KRATZ: All right, judge. 16 17 THE COURT: You may proceed. 18 Q. (By Attorney Kratz) ~ And the other vehicle, or 19 what I quess would be considered the front 20 license plate, you said that was Exhibit No. 4; 21 is that right? 22 A. Yes, that's correct. And I have now directed your attention to that on 23 0. a large skween -- screen, excuse me, once again, 24 Exhibit No. 4, the large screen photo here, 25

accurately reflects Exhibit No. 4; is that 1 2 correct? Yes, it does. 3 A. All right. I have now handed you what's been 4 marked for identification as Exhibit No. 5, tell 5 us what that is, please. 6 It is the picture we looked at not too long ago 7 A. with Teresa standing outside the driver side of 8 9 her Toyota RAV4. Just for the record, Exhibit No. 5, then, would 10 Q. 11 be the image that we're looking at on the screen 12 now; is that correct? 13 A. Yes. 14 All right. By the way, Mr. Halbach, did you have 15 an idea as to when this photo was taken? Did I 16 ask you this? 17 A. You didn't ask me that. I mean, I would guess 18 sometime maybe 2004, maybe early 2005. 19 0. I guess the question that the jury needs to know 20 is, was this Toyota RAV4, the vehicle in which 21 your sister is standing in front of, the same 22 vehicle that she was driving at the end of 23 October of 2005? 24 A. Yes, it is.

You mentioned that Teresa was involved in the

25

0.

photography business; can you tell us about that a little bit?

A. Yeah, through college she developed a passion for photography and, hence, why she declared that as her major. I would say her sophomore and junior year she worked at Bay Park Square Mall in Green Bay at Picture People taking photos of children, mainly families.

After she got done doing that, during her last semester at Wisconsin, Green Bay, she started this internship with Tom Pearce of Pearce Photography in Green Bay, doing many of the same things, taking pictures of children, families, some, and also doing weddings on the weekends. So she continued working with him and then later on in 2002, she started her business, which she named Photography by Teresa, which continued up until Halloween of 2005.

- Q. Now, you indicated that you are familiar that at least one of her clients was Auto Trader

 Magazine; is that what you told us?
- A. Yes, that's correct. She in, I think it was

 October of 2004, she started working for Auto

 Trader Magazine as a way to supplement her income
 for her professional business. Since she was

just starting out with her own business, she 1 2 wouldn't always have clients. So. Yeah, just as 3 a way to have some steady income, she got this job with the Auto Trader Magazine to take 4 pictures of vehicles in people's yards, that they 5 6 were selling themselves. First photo I'm showing you has been marked as 7 Q. 8 Exhibit No. 7, can you tell us what that is, 9 please? Exhibit No. 7 is Canon PowerShot A310; it's the 10 A. 11 box for the Canon camera. It's not the camera 12 itself. 13 Q. And, once again, were you familiar that that was 14 one of the cameras that Teresa had used in her 15 employment? 16 A. Yes, I am, in her employment with Auto Trader, 17 yes. 18 The other exhibit, I think it was Exhibit No. 6; 0. 19 is that correct? 20 That's correct. A. 21 0. Can you tell me what that is, please? 22 A. It's a box for a Palm 1 Zire 31 palm pilot. 23 And, once again, the large screen, does that 0. 24 accurately depict the box, again, recovered from 25 your sister's home, the box that she saved for

her palm pilot? 1 2 Yes, it does. Was your sister kind of a pack rat; did she save 3 Q. this kind of stuff? 4 Having gone through her stuff, yeah, she saved a 5 lot of stuff, yes. 7 Was your sister married? 8 No, she's not. A. 9 Who did she live with? 10 A. She lived with a friend of hers from high school, 11 named Scott Bloedorn. He lived in the upstairs 12 of the apartment -- or of the house she was 13 renting from my parents. 14 How close was this to your parents' house? 15 A. Down the road a short ways, eighth mile, roughly 16 quarter mile. Not too far. 17 Okay. Mike, did you ever have an opportunity to 18 see or talk with your sister as she either went 19 to work for the Auto Trader Magazine or as she 20 went to work at her own studio? 21 A. As she went there? 22 Q. Yes. In other words, were you familiar with how 23 she dressed to go to work? 24 A. Yes.

Can you tell us about that.

25

0.

She would always dress professionally, especially 1 A. 2 when she was going to her professional photography business, you know, black pants, a 3 nice shirt. And if she happened to be doing Auto 4 5 Trader that same day, she would go in those same clothes. 7 But if it was -- if she wasn't going to 8 her job that day, she would dress comfortably, 9 not necessarily in professional clothes, but nice 10 clothes nonetheless. Might be a nice pair of 11 jeans and a nice shirt or, you know, maybe khakis 12 and a shirt, sweatshirt. 13 Mike, as long as we have the photos, again, what 0. 14 we're looking at here, that's a picture -- which 15 picture is that, No. 6? 16 A. That is Exhibit No. 6. 17 Q. We're going to have the actual exhibit marked so 18 that we don't just have a photo of it? 19 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Janet, is that going to be 20 No. 8? 21 THE CLERK: Yes. 22 (Exhibit No. 8 marked for identification.) 23 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Mr. Wiegert, could you 24 provide that to the witness.

(By Attorney Kratz) ~ Mr. Halbach, we're showing

25

Q.

1		you what's marked for identification as Exhibit
2		No. 8; can you show the jury and tell them what
3		that is, please?
4	A.	This is the same box as in the Exhibit No. 6,
5		it's the box for Teresa's Palm 1 Zire 31 palm
6	1	pilot.
7	Q.	And if I'm not mistaken, Exhibit No. 7, I think,
8		was the box for the Canon PowerShot A310; is that
9		right?
10	A.	That's correct.
11	Q.	We're going to have that box, actually, marked
12		for identification as Exhibit No. 9.
13		(Exhibit No. 9 marked for identification.)
14	Q.	Once, again, Mr. Wiegert will be providing that
15		to you. If you could show it to the jury and
16		tell them what Exhibit No. 9 is, please?
17	A.	Exhibit No. 9 is the box for the Canon PowerShot,
18		the A310, that Teresa used for her Auto Trader
19		job.
20	Q.	Once again, after your sister's disappearance and
21		after investigators began contacting you,
22		specifically, and your family, these items were
23		found in her personal effects and turned over; is
24		that right?
25	Α.	That's correct.

- 1 Q. Can you tell me who Pam Sturm is?
- A. Pam Sturm, to me, would be my first cousin once removed. She would be my grandma's sister's daughter.
- Q. Okay. The involvement of Pam and her daughter,

 Nikole, after your sister was missing, could you

 describe that for the jury?
- 8 A. You said her involvement?
- 9 Q. Yes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 10 Pam Sturm was the person who ended up finding A. 11 Teresa's vehicle on the Avery salvage yard. I 12 recall coming home that day, after I had been 13 with my brother driving, in her -- being inside 14 my parents' house crying and my mom telling me 15 that we found the vehicle -- or Pam found the 16 vehicle, Pam and her daughter, Nikole. So, I guess that would be her involvement. 17
 - Q. All right. Let's go back just a little bit,
 Mike, if we can. After your mom reported your
 sister missing on the 3rd of November, how was it
 that you were informed of that?
 - A. On Thursday, November 3rd, I was working. I got a call from my mom that afternoon at about 2:00 or 2:30 wondering if I knew where -- or if I had talked to my sister in the previous, you know,

1 since Sunday. And I said that I hadn't.

And so I went on to call one of Teresa's good friends at her work and asked her if she had known where Teresa could be. Because it was completely unlike her to go somewhere without telling anyone, especially a family member, a good friend, her roommate, or her boss.

So, I guess after we made those calls it became very evident to me that something was seriously wrong and I expressed that to my mom.

Then shortly after -- and she was, you know, she was in agreement, obviously; she knew something was wrong, just like everyone else did.

- Q. Did the family ask for some assistance and did you receive it from some of Teresa's friends regarding searching for her?
- A. In searching for her we, you know, all we had to
 do was make a couple phone calls to some of
 Teresa's friends and they would call numerous
 other people. We needed help passing -- passing
 out posters on Friday, November 4th and also
 doing searches by car on Saturday, the 5th and
 doing searches by foot a few days following that.
 So, whenever we needed help, we had help from
 Teresa's friends, family members, community

1 members. Anyone who wanted to help, who had 2 time, would help us out in searching for Teresa. 3 0. Who is Ryan Hillegas? 4 A. Ryan Hillegas is -- he was Teresa's ex-boyfriend. 5 They were together a few years and then were off 6 a few years once they went to college. And he, 7 basically, organized most or probably all the 8 search efforts that we did for Teresa. Him, 9 along with Scott Bloedorn, did the majority of 10 getting people together and telling people where 11 to go to search for Teresa. 12 Q. I ask you to refer back to this photo, can you 13 tell me what exhibit that is, again? Exhibit No. 5. 14 A. 15 Q. Okay. I can see by your sister's physical 16 stature, but if you can just verify for us, was 17 Teresa in good physical condition? 18 Yes, she was. She had a -- she went to a gym. A. 19 don't know how regularly, but she had a 20 membership at a gym and was -- seemed physically 21 fit, yes. 22 Mike, I think you talked about, on the 3rd, 0. 23 meeting with your family, and on the 4th, really, 24 the citizen efforts for Teresa's search kind of 25 ramped up; but can give you us any more details

about that?

A. Yeah, on the -- Well, the day we reported Teresa missing, that Thursday, we had got a call from a man named Jay Breyer who offered his services at Youth Educated in Safety, which is a missing persons organization. He offered to make copies and make up a missing persons poster.

so we took him up on that offer that night, finalized the poster and then the following afternoon we had got copies made. He had made the copies and around 2:00 or 2:30 in the afternoon was when we were meeting with whoever had the time and the vehicle to drive across all of northeast Wisconsin to put up these posters, which basically said, you know, missing person, Teresa Halbach, height, weight, what she was wearing that day. So that's what happened on Friday afternoon.

- Q. Mike, Mr. Fallon is going to hand you what's been marked for identification as Exhibit No. 10. I'm going to put it up on the screen for the jurors.

 Can you tell us what we're looking at, please?
- A. That's the missing persons poster that Jay Breyer helped us make that we put up on the 3rd -- or the Friday, the 5th -- or, yeah -- the 4th,

- 1 Friday, the 4th. That's right.
- Q. Indicates that your sister was 5 feet 6 inches tall, 135 pounds; is that approximately accurate?
- 4 A. Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, after -- First of all, let me ask you
 where -- where these posters distributed, if you
 recall?
- It would have been a very large area of northeast 8 A. 9 Wisconsin including Appleton, Green Bay, 10 Manitowoc, Chilton, south towards Milwaukee, east 11 to the Lakeshore. And I recall semi-drivers 12 wanting to, you know, stop at the house, pick up 13 some fliers because they were concerned as well. 14 And they were going to Madison, Milwaukee and 15 further. So they had volunteered to put up 16 posters for us on their routes.
 - Q. Mr. Halbach, let me ask you this, did you try to recreate, from the 31st of October, routes that Teresa may have taken?
 - A. Yes. Yeah, so those were our main areas we wanted to put up these posters, as well as to search by vehicle and by foot, because we could trace her whereabouts to, you know, a certain location. That's where you want to focus most of your efforts. So that's what we did.

Q. All right. Perhaps you answered this and I
apologize if you did, but do you recall how many
thousands of these posters you distributed?

- A. I guess I can't recall specifically, but it would be, you know, probably a couple thousand.
- Q. All right. Now, we're going to hear from Mr.

 Hillegas a little bit later in the trial

 regarding the specifics of the missing persons

 investigations, but did those search efforts

 include actually walking around or looking in

 roadways or ditches?
- A. Yeah, that Saturday morning, the 5th, that morning, it was about 7:00 a.m., a group of volunteers met at my sister's house and we set out by vehicle to -- to basically trace the routes that she may have taken that Monday.

And certain people were given different areas, not necessarily the places she definitely traveled, but perhaps she drove down to Milwaukee to meet with someone, or drove up to Door County, so we had people driving in those areas as well. But myself, specifically, I went with my brother to the places where we -- and the routes that we thought for sure she could have taken, you know. Since we were her brothers, we can get it in her

mind better than anyone. So we drove over there.

I can recall specifically driving down
Highway 147, getting out, looking down
embankments where, if you would drive by
casually, you wouldn't be able to see down there.
So, we thought maybe she had gotten in an
automobile accident, was trapped, you know,
unconscious, whatever it may be. So we wanted to
do what we could to eliminate that possibility.

So, you know, we looked wherever we could, drove around as many roads as we could, side roads, back roads, whatever, just looking for signs of her vehicle or Teresa herself.

- Q. And until that call came, or until the news came on the 5th, that Teresa's vehicle had been found, was that your hope that there had been some accident or something?
- A. Yeah, I mean, from the start I think it's just the way my family is, is we're strong, optimistic, also, you know, realistic too. But, yeah, we hoped to find some sign and we hoped we would find Teresa alive.

So when we found her vehicle, it was good because we were getting closer to finding Teresa. So we were happy to find the vehicle,

but we didn't find Teresa, so that half the goal was missing. We didn't accomplish half the goal when we found the vehicle.

- Q. All right. Mike, I had mentioned at the early stages of the presentation of this case, in fact, to the jury, about meetings that you had with law enforcement, meetings you had with me, individually, throughout this case. Have you been kept informed as to the developments and the evidence, not just that was found, but the evidence that was going to be presented at this case?
- A. Yes, we had always -- were informed in advance of anything, whether it be a news conference, whether it be information that would be submitted to the courthouse and available to the media, shortly thereafter. We would always be aware of what was going to be said in the media or what not. And in advance of every court hearing, we have been kept informed of what we would hear that day, just so there were no surprises; so we could prepare ourselves emotionally for those events.
- Q. That includes the physical evidence that is going to be presented at this trial?

1	A.	Yes, that's correct.
2	Q.	The last question I have, Mike, and I'm going to
3		apologize in advance as to the insensitivity of
4		it, but at any time after the 31st of October,
5		had you ever seen, spoken from, or heard from
6		your sister, Teresa Halbach?
7	A.	No, I have not.
8		ATTORNEY KRATZ: I would move the admission
9		of Exhibit 1 through 10.
10		THE COURT: Any objection?
11		ATTORNEY STRANG: No objection at all.
12		THE COURT: Those exhibits are admitted.
13		ATTORNEY KRATZ: No further questions.
14		THE COURT: Mr. Strang.
15		ATTORNEY STRANG: Is this working now?
16		THE COURT: Yes, it is.
17		ATTORNEY STRANG: All right.
18		CROSS-EXAMINATION
19	BY 2	ATTORNEY STRANG:
20	Q.	Thanks for coming. And I don't have a lot of
21		questions. I don't want to make this any harder
22		a day for you than it's already been. But, we
23		have established that Teresa was 5 foot 6, about
24		135 pounds, back in October of 2005?
25	A.	Yes.

1 Q. Give or take. You said she was fit. She was an 2 athlete to some extent? To some extent, she played a little in high 4 school, but I know she would exercise at our home 5 as well. 6 Q. Sure. Little volleyball, was that her sport, or 7 basketball, or both? 8 A. Well, she coached her sister's 7th grade 9 volleyball team, so there was definitely an 10 interest there. 11 0. Was that her sport in high school? 12 A. She played some. I don't think she played past 13 her sophomore year, but ... 14 0. Okay. But, you know, I mean, somebody who was at 15 least reasonably athletic and fit? 16 A. Right. 17 In addition to working out at home, she belonged 18 to some private gym somewhere? 19 A. Correct. 20 Q. Okay. You guys were all raised on a dairy farm; 21 did you grow up there? 22 Yeah, for the most part, yeah. A. 23 Q. Working a dairy farm? 24 A. Yes. 25 And when you say for the most part, is that not 179

1 when you were a little bitty boy, or ... 2 A. Up until I was eight years old on, I was on the 3 dairy farm, yes. 4 Q. Okay. Sure. And you, the kids, helped out with 5 chores, I assume? 6 A. Correct. 7 Like all farm kids have to? 0. 8 A. Yes. 9 That included Teresa? Q. She didn't help out in the barn as much as she 10 A. 11 helped out in the house, babysitting for our 12 sisters and taking care of chores in the house. 13 0. She did get acquainted with milking, though, at some point, I assume? 14 15 Very seldomly. A. 16 Was that mostly the boys? 0. 17 Yeah. Yes. A. 18 She was someone who had a good sense of humor? 19 A. Yes. Q. Also could stand up for herself, though? 20 21 A. Absolutely. Little bit feisty in a good way? 22 0. 23 A. Yes. Yeah, and I don't mean in a bad way, but I mean 24 Q. 25 she was personable? 180

Yes, independent. 1 A. 2 And your family, I take -- I take it is Q. 3 tightknit, your immediate family? 4 A. Yes. 5 By that, I mean Tom and Karen, your folks, or you Q. 6 and Tim, Katie and Kelly and Teresa? 7 Yes. A. 8 Q. But you guys also have a pretty good extended 9 family in this area, as I understand it? 10 A. Yes, we do. 11 Q. Has the family been in Calumet County or this 12 area for generations? 13 A. Yes. Yeah. 14 Q. Okay. I mean, in other words, you know Pam 15 Sturm, you were saying is a first cousin once 16 removed? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. I couldn't possibly tell you how you got there but, I mean, you have got all kinds of cousins, 19 20 aunts, uncles? 21 A. Yes. 22 0. That kind of thing, in the area? 23 A. Yes.

181

So, in addition to Teresa's friends, you had a

lot of family to pull on when looking for her?

24

25

Q.

- 1 A. Correct.
- Q. This -- this effort to retrace her steps on
- October 31, did that -- did that get going,
- 4 Mr. Halbach, pretty much right away, the evening
- 5 that you all reported her missing.
- 6 A. Yeah. Yeah, we had talked about where we knew
- 7 Teresa was on the 31st; what appointments she
- 8 had, where she was supposed to be before then,
- you know, where she was supposed to be after then
- 10 and the days following, as well.
- 11 Q. Okay. On the 31st, were you able to nail down
- 12 appointments?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. So, I mean, do you think it was that Thursday
- night that you figured out that Avery Auto
- 16 Salvage was one of the appointments; if you
- 17 remember?
- 18 A. I don't remember exactly if it was that night, or
- if it was the next day, or -- it was one of those
- 20 two.
- 21 Q. Either Thursday night or Friday morning, the 4th?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Okay. And at some point pretty quickly, the
- 24 media all got interested in this; am I recalling
- 25 that correctly?

1 A. Yes. Was it Friday, already on the TV they were 2 3 talking about the Avery Auto Salvage or flying 4 over it, that kind of thing? 5 A. I don't recall, specifically, myself, you know, 6 seeing the media involvements saying Steven Avery, but I know that they reported on the 7 missing persons case involving my sister, that 8 9 Thursday night. Oh, right away Thursday night? 10 0. 11 A. Correct. And then Friday and I know by Saturday, there was 12 Q. a lot of media coverage? 13 14 A. Yes. Not that you were watching but, I mean, you were 15 Q. out -- that you were just sort of aware of it? 16 17 A. Yes. Did you -- Did you have access to her computer 18 19 passwords or account information for, like, her 20 cell phone, for example, or bills, that kind of 21 thing? 22 A. Cell phone, yes; computer password, yes. 23 0. She had shared that with you at some time earlier? 24 I did business work for her, website graphics, 25 A.

1 SO --2 Q. Oh. 3 I, yeah, I just knew it through that. A. 4 So, you knew it through that --5 A. Correct. 6 -- because you would have a reason to get on to Q. 7 her computer to help her with her website? 8 A. Well, I didn't have to go on her computer, but I had to connect to a web host --9 10 Sure. 0. -- just to put stuff for her website, so. 11 A. 12 Okay. I'm nodding like I know what you are Q. talking about and I really don't. But the point 13 is you had -- you had access to her password 14 information so you could check her cell phone 15 16 bill? I never did. I don't know -- So since I never 17 A. did, I wouldn't know if I had the right password 18 for her cell phone bill. I knew --19 20 Q. Okay. -- her password for her voice mail. 21 A. And that's where I was going. I think -- I think 22 0. on Thursday evening, November 3, somebody was 23 able to get at her cell phone records on the 24 computer, but that was not you? 25

- 1 A. I don't think on her computer, no.
- 2 Q. Okay. And you didn't have her voice mail?
- 3 A. I said I did -- did have her voice mail password.
- 4 Q. You did have her voice mail password. Okay. Did
- 5 you check voice mails?
- 6 A. I did.
- 7 Q. Do you remember when you did that?
- 8 A. It was probably Thursday evening, early evening.
- 9 Q. After your mom --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | O. -- had --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- filed a missing persons report?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. So I take it you were at work earlier that
- 16 day?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. And the missing person report was sort of at the
- end of the day, 5:00 or something?
- 20 A. Correct.
- Q. Were you familiar enough with Teresa Halbach's
- 22 everyday stuff to know what -- what she carried
- 23 keys to?
- 24 A. I mean, yes, I think I would have an idea of what
- 25 keys she would have, yes.

- 1 Q. Okay. Let's just -- Let's start with the house
- 2 that she and Scott Bloedorn were sharing, this
- 3 was the older farmhouse?
- 4 A. At one point it was a farmhouse.
- 5 Q. Okay. Is it actually on the Halbach farm or just
- 6 next door or ...
- 7 A. It's next door, my parent's home, the house and
- 8 the land.
- 9 Q. Okay. But it --
- 10 A. It's not -- It doesn't share a driveway at all.
- 11 Q. Yeah.
- 12 A. It has its own driveway.
- 13 Q. Separate parcel, but next door.
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. Can you see the two houses from one another?
- 16 A. You have to look through a line of evergreens and
- there's a big shed a little further back, but you
- can see it through the trees, yes.
- 19 Q. But they are next door neighbors, essentially;
- 20 although it's a rural area?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. Okay. And I take it there was -- there was a
- 23 house key to the house? Go ahead.
- 24 A. Yes, there was.
- 25 Q. Do you know whether there was a separate garage

- 1 key?
- 2 A. I believe that's correct.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- 4 A. I would imagine there was.
- Q. And do you have -- do you have any way of knowing
- 6 whether Teresa would also have had keys to your
- 7 folk's house?
- 8 A. I don't think she did.
- 9 Q. You told us the Toyota was the only car she was
- driving, so she didn't have keys to other cars,
- as far as you know?
- 12 A. Correct, she didn't, no other keys.
- 13 Q. Swipe card for the gym?
- 14 A. I can't recall if she specifically had a swipe
- 15 card. She must have had something to get into
- 16 the gym. I forget what it would have been.
- 17 Q. Okay. And if you know, was she someone with,
- 18 like, a lot of people, I guess, who would have
- 19 had some doodads, or charms, or that kind of
- 20 thing on the key chain?
- 21 A. I don't ever recall her having any of that, a lot
- of fancy stuff on her key chain, no.
- Q. Okay. The gathering at -- was at grandpa's house
- on Sunday, October 30?
- 25 A. That's correct.

For his -- for his birthday? 1 Q. 2 A. Correct. And then, I think -- Were there, if you know, did 3 0. 4 she -- had she had plans to go to a Halloween 5 party the Saturday night right before that? 6 I believe so. Earlier in the evening she was 7 helping me with a wedding, shooting a wedding 8 video. After that I think she would have went to a Halloween party. I believe that's correct. 9 10 Okay. Saturday night, October 29? Q. Right. Yeah, it would have been later on in the 11 A. 12 night. 13 Let's just sort of help the jury with that. Q. 14 You're -- You're a videographer. You're in the video business? 15 16 A. Correct. So not only would she be a photographer for 17 Q. weddings, but you also videotape weddings as a 18 business, or a side business at times. 19 Well, that was the only one that I had. That was 20 A. my first time and I haven't done one since then. 21 Okay. But the two of you were helping each other 22 Q. out with that one? 23 24 A. Right.

I didn't notice one in the picture, whichever

25

0.

1		number it is, where Teresa is standing next to
2		her Toyota when she has got her camera; I didn't
3		notice there, but did she ordinarily carry a
4		purse?
5	A.	I don't recall her having a purse well I
6		can't say for sure.
7	Q.	That's okay. That's all right. How about, I
8		mean, did you did you notice, was she a
9		jewelry person, bracelets, necklaces?
10	A.	Not a whole lot of jewelry, really, at all. I
11		don't maybe a couple of rings.
12	Q.	Not bracelets, though, or necklaces.
13	A.	Probably not too often.
14	Q.	How about earrings?
15	A.	I don't recall her wearing earrings very often
16		either.
17		ATTORNEY STRANG: That's all I have. Thank
18	Y .	you.
19		THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, any redirect?
20		ATTORNEY KRATZ: Not for this witness,
21		Judge. Thank you.
22		THE COURT: Very well, you are excused.
23		ATTORNEY KRATZ: Next witness, Judge?
24		THE COURT: You may call your next witness.
25		ATTORNEY KRATZ: Tom Pearce.

1		THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.
2		THOMAS PEARCE, called as a witness
3		herein, having been first duly sworn, was
4		examined and testified as follows:
5	1	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
6		THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Kratz.
7		THE CLERK: Please state your name and
8		spell your last name for the record.
9		THE WITNESS: Thomas Pearce, P-e-a-r-c-e.
10		DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY .	ATTORNEY KRATZ:
12	Q.	Mr. Pearce, how are you employed?
13	A.	I'm sorry?
14	Q.	How are you employed?
15	A.	I'm self-employed.
16	Q.	Can you tell the jury in what capacity?
17	A.	I'm a professional photographer. I have my own
18		studio.
19	Q.	Did you know a young woman by the name of Teresa
20	m	Halbach?
21	A.	Oh, yes, I did.
22	Q.	Can you tell the jury how you first became
23		knowledgable about Ms Halbach?
24	A.	It was in January of 202 (sic), through an
25		internship program through the university. She
		190

approached me to do an internship through the university and I took her on as an intern. And from there on, through the internship program which ends when she graduates, I saw that she was an exceptional person in photography and for her age, that I asked her to stay on and work through my studio or with me doing weddings and portraits.

- Q. What university was this?
- 10 A. University of Green Bay.

- Q. I think you mentioned that you had seen something in her that actually made you offer her a job; can you tell us what that was?
- A. Well, you know, in this field, you see -- and I have worked with other interns and some of them do have the drive, the passion, the want and knowing that -- Being a photographer, a lot of people think it's very easy. It's a lot of hours. It's a lot of dedicated work.

And she had that and I haven't seen that in many people in a lot of years. And I was impressed with that. She knew the responsibility, the sacrifices it took. And she was eager to learn. She was consistently asking questions and from -- doing different projects

and so on. So I was very impressed with her and that's why I asked her to stay on.

Q. Was she technically good at what she did?

A. Yes. The university -- I also went to school, but not here in Green Bay. They teach you the book. And how should I say, you should know the rules before you know how to break them. And that's part of out in the field.

And that's why I think the internship program is a good program. Because it has -- In many different fields, people come out and see what it's really like in everyday life and not so much how the book says it. But you have got to know the book, but you have to break the rules when you are out there.

- Q. After offering Teresa a job, or employment through your studio; how long did that last and did that evolve into some other business relationship.
- A. As far as working for me, or I should say really with me, she was a go-getter, like I said, she had that passion. And I looked and as a -- when you are a staff photographer for someone, you have got to abide by their ways of doing things, their policies, because you are working for them,

so you have to do stuff their way.

Well, I didn't want to hold her back because she was incredibly involved and had that passion for this. So, on the other hand, I didn't want to not lose her, but have her go out and go, hit and miss, hit and miss, which a lot of young photographers do.

I had a full studio, plenty of room for both of us. So we sat down and we talked and we did something that no one has done before. She started her own business, not be in competition, but complimenting each other.

So she worked out of my studio; she used all the facilities of the studio, but she ran her own business through that -- through my studio.

Meanwhile, we cooperated in doing advertising together, promotions, learning, helping one another. I would book weddings for her, she would book for me. There was never any competition between us. And it was something unusual, but it worked out very well for both of us.

- Q. Did she call upon you for advice?
- A. Many times, yes. And it was, basically, not only the technical end of it, the photography end of

it, but on how to run a business, what is needed behind the scenes. And that's where in this business a lot of the people that get into the photography business, they know photography but they don't know the business end of it.

So, yes, I did mentor her in a lot of different areas. Thirty-eight years of experience, and I wanted to share that with her, because I could see that she was, basically, like me when I came out of college -- school. I was eager. I had the passion. We had a lot of similarities. I graduated from -- with a degree in photography.

I was the -- also worked the photo school newspaper and she did. And I worked at many different studios before I moved up here in the Green Bay market. So we had that same background. And I think it's a duty for any of us to share what we have learned, our experiences with someone up and coming.

Q. I think, Mr. Pearce, you talked about weddings and portraits and the like, that was -- or at the -- by the fall of 2005, had Teresa been developing a particular niche within the photography business?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Your Honor, I wonder if 1 we could approach the side bar for just a moment. 2 THE COURT: Sure. 3 (Side bar taken.) 4 (By Attorney Kratz) ~ Mr. Pearce, could you 5 Q. discuss whether or not Teresa had developed a 6 particular niche within the photography business? 7 I think if there was any one area, it was 8 A. children. She loved to photograph children of 9 all ages. She had a knack for that. But as far 10 as a niche, I mean, we all -- that would be her 11 certain niche, but she was well versed at doing 12 weddings, and good at doing weddings and 13 portraits and family. But her love was doing 14 children, from all ages of children. 15 Now, as part of that business, as part of 16 0. Teresa's photography business, were you aware of 17 a particular client that she serviced, which was 18 Auto Trader Magazine? 19 There was a time when she had told me about, that 20 A. she had picked up a client, which was Auto 21 Trader, and she would be running around taking 22 pictures of cars, yes, I was aware of that. 23 All right. And had she ever asked your opinion 24 0. or advice about working for Auto Trader or that 25

kind of photography?

A. I don't think she asked my advice, but I think I may have suggested something to her. Her photography business was picking up for studio wise a lot. And it seemed like when she -- It seemed when she first started with Auto Trader was just on Mondays. Mondays we're typically closed in the industry, because we worked a lot of Saturdays.

So, it seemed all of a sudden that she not only had to do Auto Trader on Monday, but possibly Wednesdays and some Saturdays. She was constantly telling me that she was running doing Auto Trader. And I could see that she was starting to burn the candle at both ends.

And at one time, I sat her down and I said, gee, you know, you are running here, you are running here, you're running and I didn't want her to get to a burn out point. So I just asked her, how is Auto Trader, is it a good client, blah, blah, blah.

We never talked on how much she was making, or whatever. That -- that was never discussed. I mean, that was where we drew the line in our business end of it, but I was more

concerned about her well being of running, of the 1 constant running. She was constantly running and that's what she enjoyed. So that was the only time I really had any discussion with her about Auto Trader. Let me ask you this, Mr. Pearce, are you familiar with the defendant, Steven Avery? As far as familiar with him, as far as what? Α. Have you heard the name before the 31st of 0. October? A.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just one time and I think it was the spring, late spring or early summer, Teresa had mentioned to me, she said kind of matter-of-factly, you will never guess whose cars I was taking pictures of. And she told me the name and it didn't ring a bell.

She actually had to remind me or say, oh, that was the guy that was wrongfully convicted and so on and so forth. And we had a little discussion and then I remembered the case and so on and so. We talked about -- a little bit about her being out and about, running around all over the county, by herself, and her safety and so on and so forth. And that was basically it. That was the only time she ever mentioned it

1 to me. 2 All right. We have learned that Teresa Halbach 0. drove a 1999 Toyota RAV4 SUV, picture's in front 3 of you. Would you look on the back; what exhibit 4 5 number is that? 6 05 CF 381, Exhibit 5. A. 7 All right. Have you ever seen that vehicle 0. 8 before? Oh, sure. She was working with me when she 9 purchased it. Actually, I took that picture. 10 And she was happy as a lark to have her first 11 car. She used to have a beater that was an older 12 car, not a beater. And now this allowed her 13 freedom to go. Yeah, she was very happy with 14 15 that car. Turning now to a more serious series of topics, 16 Q. Mr. Pearce, sometime after the 31st of October, 17 after that Monday, after the Halloween; did you 18 see Teresa the next day at work, Tuesday, the 1st 19 of November? 20

A. No, like I said earlier, Mondays we were closed.

Actually, the last time I saw Teresa was

Saturday, before the 31st. When Tuesday came,

she had her own hours because she had her own

business. Since I'm there like 60 hours a week;

21

22

23

24

she may have been there one week 20 hours. All depended on her schedule and so on. But she always kept me informed of was she going to be gone for a day; did she have appointments; was she going to take off for a weekend; etc. She was very responsible in that sense, extremely responsible for a young person.

Well, Tuesday came and by noon she
wasn't there. I didn't think too much, oh, okay,
I know she was there Saturday working, did Auto
Trader. So I'm going through my mind, well,
what -- I knew Wednesday, because every Wednesday
morning, she actually was one of the founders of
a BMG Group, BMG marketing group, Business
Marketing Group that meets once a week. Business
leaders, they go over leads and what's going on
in Green Bay and so on.

She was one of the founders and very active in it. She usually would come in, oh, about, sometimes 11:00, 11:30 on that Wednesday, religiously. Because she would be in town for that meeting. So Wednesday around noon, she didn't show up. I thought, okay, this is a little strange. I tried calling her and I got her cell phone, but her phone book and it was

- full, where I couldn't even leave a message.
 - 2 Q. Her voice mail?
 - 3 A. Her voice mail box, that's it, yes, it was full.
 - I couldn't even leave a message. I thought this
 - was a little strange, because typically you get
 - 6 right through to her. She was very good at
 - 7 returning calls; very good at leaving messages
 - and letting me know. So kind of, well, maybe
 - 9 she's sick, you know, with the flu, flu season,
- 10 covered up under the covers, turn the cell phone
- off, just go and doing that.
- 12 Q. Sure.
- 13 A. So I thought, well, for sure she'll be in
- 14 Thursday. And I had called, a couple times, her
- cell phone. So by Thursday, now, I haven't heard
- 16 from her.
- 17 Q. This is Thursday the 3rd of November.
- 18 A. Right. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. What did you do then?
- 20 A. I tried to call her again, same thing, with the
- 21 phone. Now, some of her work was coming in,
- 22 being shipped in to be processed. And I knew
- 23 that she knew, she kept track of that. So, if
- she was out of town or sick, I think she would
- 25 have called me by this time. And I started

getting really, really worried.

I didn't know who to call, her friends, etcetera, so I think was around 1:00, somewhere in that time period. I called Karen, Teresa's mother, seeing if she knew. That was the only phone number I had, other than Teresa's. I didn't have any of her friend's. And talked to Karen about it. And she was going to call some of her friends, or she already had. And the next thing I know it was 10:00, on the news, I heard it was, officially, that Teresa was missing.

- Q. Perhaps you can help us, Mr. Pearce. Are you familiar with use of digital cameras, digital film and how a digital camera can imprint or create an electronic signature on photos that are taken there from?
- A. I'm not a real good expert on digital, but I know some of what the digital cameras do, if that's what you're --
- Q. I'm going to direct you to some images and when you take the cursor for a computer over a digital image, as an example, this image gives the dimensions, gives the date the picture taken is 10/10/05 at 3:18 p.m. Camera model, it indicates Canon PowerShot A310 to JPEG image and the size

1		of that. Are you familiar with the taking, or
2		production of digital photography, that those
3		kinds of details are provided right in the image
4		itself? Do you understand the question?
5	A.	Yes. Yes, sir. Absolutely true, they are.
6		Unless you get a 10 or \$15 or \$20 digital camera,
7		the nicer cameras, even the smaller ones, will do
8		that automatically in their programing for that.
9	Q.	All right. Same question I have asked another
10		witness and I will ask you Mr. Pearce, after
11	1	the well, really after the 29th of October,
12		2005, had you ever heard or spoken to Teresa
13		Halbach?
14	Α.	No.
15		ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all I have for this
16		witness, Judge. Thank you.
17		THE COURT: Mr. Strang.
18	N.	CROSS-EXAMINATION
19	BY A	ATTORNEY STRANG:
20	Q.	Mr. Pearce, the Teresa Halbach you knew was
21		someone you described once as feisty?
22	Α.	Well, depends on how you mean feisty.
23	Q.	How did you mean it?
24	Α.	Full of energy.
25	Q.	Someone who was in good shape and could fight
		202

1 back? 2 I would think so. 3 0. She carried a cell phone regularly? 4 A. I'm sorry, I can't hear you. 5 She carried a cell phone regularly? Q. 6 As far as I know, yes, that was her life line. 7 Q. But that wasn't something she would hook on a 8 belt or do one of these things, she would keep it 9 in her purse? 10 A. Well, most of the time when I would see her, she 11 would have it out of her purse and on the 12 counter. 13 Q. If she were out somewhere, though, the cell phone 14 was always in her purse, I think you have said 15 before? 16 I couldn't answer that 100 percent. I would 17 think so. She was in her car, maybe it would be 18 on the driver's seat. I know it went with her 19 wherever she went. 20 0. And when she was at Pearce Photography, she frequently would leave the cell phone out on the 21 22 counter. If she was out somewhere else, it was 23 in her purse, typically, that was your experience

Well, I know when she was at work it was always

24

25

A.

with her?

1 out in the open on the counter, just like this 2 picture sitting here, because that was her 3 business line. When she was out -- out of the 4 studio, I really don't know what she did with her 5 cell phone. 6 I'm going to show you a report of an interview Q. 7 that you had with an agent named Alan Hunsader; 8 do you remember talking with him? 9 A. Sure. 10 0. I'm going to offer it as an exhibit, I'm just 11 hoping it might refresh your recollection about 12 the cell phone. I invite you to look at the last 13 paragraph on that page. Just to yourself. 14 A. Yeah, I guess. 15 0. Does that help --16 A. Yeah. 17 Q. -- refresh your recollection about your 18 experience with Teresa Halbach and her cell 19 phone? 20 A. When we would shoot a wedding together she would 21 have her cell phone in her purse. Through her --22 When -- When we would go to -- give an example, 23 we did a lot of work in a park which was 5 24 minutes away from us, doing weddings, even in her 25 training time she would keep her cell phone in

- her purse. That was my oversight.
- Q. You described it as her lifeline just a few
 minutes ago.
- 4 A. Right.
- 5 Q. Was that the only number you had for her?
- 6 A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 Q. You don't know whether she had a land line phone 8 in her home?
- 9 A. I don't think so.
- Q. You were aware that she evidently shared her cell phone number with Auto Trader customers.
 - A. I knew at one time she said to me that she was able to give out her business cards to the Auto Trader. So in that respect I guess, yeah, because her cell phone number would be on that.
 - Q. And indeed there was -- there were at least a few occasions on which you were aware that she was getting calls on her cell phone from customers or dissatisfied customers of Auto Trader and she would refer those to the Auto Trader office?
 - A. She mentioned to me a couple times that people were calling her direct. They had a problem with Auto Trader, or whatever the case may be.
 - Q. She said, don't bother me, call the Auto Trader office?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. What -- What day was it, as best as you can
- 3 recall, and I'm going to chase the time to, if
- 4 you can, that you first called Teresa's cell
- 5 phone the week of October 31 and found the voice
- 6 mailbox full?
- 7 A. I think it would have been Tuesday afternoon and
- 8 that -- somewhere in that time period.
- 9 Q. And the voice mail box was full?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. And then Wednesday, before this marketing
- group luncheon, after she didn't show up; did you
- 13 try that again?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 | O. Still full voice mailbox?
- 16 A. Still full.
- 17 Q. And if I understood you correctly, you said you
- 18 tried again Thursday?
- 19 A. Mm-hmm, yes, sir.
- 20 Q. So full voice mailbox Tuesday, Wednesday and
- 21 Thursday?
- 22 A. I believe, I'm almost positive all three times,
- 23 because I thought that was very unusual.
- 24 Q. Starting Tuesday, mid-afternoon.
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. This studio, it was your studio, but she was
- 2 sharing space, if I understood you --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- correctly?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Keys, keys to the studio, one, more than one?
- 7 A. She had a set of keys, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. What is a set of keys, meaning to the studio?
- 9 A. Well, as myself, we always carry two, so that --
- I mean, it's the same key, but in case we drop
- 11 it. And Teresa had a funny thing about not
- losing her keys, but misplacing her keys all the
- 13 time. So I gave her two, one to put on her key
- chain and one to put in her purse somewhere, so
- she always has it. So, two keys.
- 16 Q. If she mislaid the key chain?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. So the office key was one of the keys on
- 19 that key chain?
- 20 A. I would think so.
- 21 Q. Is it a key chain you saw?
- 22 A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Is it a key chain that you ever saw?
- 24 A. Laying on the counter or something, yes.
- 25 Q. Okay. It had a number of keys on it?

- A. I would think maybe three or four.
- Q. Okay. About three weeks before she disappeared,

 Teresa Halbach, you were aware, had been getting
 a lot of telephone calls that she was not

 answering on the cell phone?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. They would leave no message?
 - A. If you are referring to the same thing, I think, she was standing almost right next to me, in a day, and she got this phone call. And she looked at it and went, said, oh, not them again, or not him again, and just kind of forgot about it.

She looked a little upset, so I
questioned her a little bit about this and she
told me, just forget about it. Somebody keeps
calling her all different hours, a nuisance call.
And that was about two or three weeks and she had
mentioned that she had been getting them for
awhile and I had said, well, why don't you give
me the number and I will call and find out
instead of her dealing with it and she said, no,
don't worry about it. But that's, I think, what
you're talking about.

Q. Right. And whatever the number was that came up on the phone, she recognized it?

Yeah, she knew what it was, but she wouldn't let 1 A. 2 me know. ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you. 3 Any other questions, Mr. Kratz? THE COURT: 4 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Just one area of inquiry 5 of Mr. Pearce. 6 7 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY KRATZ: 8 Mr. Pearce, would you have considered yourself as 9 long -- or together with a mentor, being a friend 10 of Teresa's? 11 A good friend and a good colleague, yes. 12 In that regard, had you ever admonished or warned 13 0. Teresa about her behavior, if she was alone with 14 somebody in a home? 15 ATTORNEY STRANG: Relevance. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Kratz. 17 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, it actually will be 18 relevant to the false imprisonment charge. The 19 issue of being restrained or confined. If 20 admonished by an individual that that shouldn't 21 occur, it goes to that particular element of that 22 offense. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Strang. 24 ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't know that we 25 209

ought to be arguing the point here. I'm not at all 1 2 convinced of the relevance. THE COURT: I don't know about the 3 relevance, but I think its beyond the scope of 4 redirect. I'm going to sustain the objection. 5 ATTORNEY STRANG: We can't hear the Court. 6 THE COURT: It's beyond the scope of 7 redirect. I'm sustaining the objection. 8 ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all I have of 9 Mr. Pearce then, Judge. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: You're excused. 11 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Could we approach just 12 briefly, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Sure. 14 (Side bar taken.) 15 THE COURT: For the benefit of the jurors, 16 I informed counsel that I really didn't want to go 17 beyond 4:30 today. I'm aware of the fact that you 18 have not only been sitting in the jury box most of 19 the day, but also the fact that there's travel to 20 and from Manitowoc each day. So unless it is really 21 important, I'm going to do my best to get you out of 22 here at 4:30 all the time. But I have been told 23 that there is a witness who isn't going to take very 24

210

long. So, Mr. Kratz, you may call your witness.

1		ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. We call
2	1	David Beach to the stand.
3		THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
4		DAVID BEACH, called as a witness herein,
5		having been first duly sworn, was examined and
6		testified as follows:
7	K	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state
8		your name and spell your last name for the record.
9		THE WITNESS: My name is David Beach. My
10		last name is spelled B-e-a-c-h.
11		THE COURT: Mr. Beach, I'm going to ask you
12		to get a little closer to the microphone.
13		DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY .	ATTORNEY KRATZ:
15	Q.	Mr. Beach, do you know a woman by the name of
16		Teresa Halbach?
17	A.	Yes, I did.
18	Q.	How did you know her?
19	A.	She was my cousin.
20	Q.	Sometime on Friday, the 4th of November, did you
21		volunteer to assist in a search for Teresa?
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	And in that regard, were you with somebody else,
24		or paired up with somebody in that search?
25	Α.	I was paired with my older sister, Sarah Beach.
		211

- Q. On Friday, the 4th of November, did you make any stops, or what was your -- or what did your search efforts entail?
 - A. I met up with my sister and our search effort was to look for her vehicle. So we got some information from the Halbachs about what her schedule was, where she had -- the area that she was going to and we just tried to track down the Toyota.
- 10 Q. All right. In that effort, Mr. Beach, did you
 11 find your way to the Avery Salvage Yard property?
- 12 A. Yes.

- Q. And could you tell the jury, please, what occurred once you got to that property.
 - A. We came to the property. I was the passenger in the vehicle. I stepped out, I went into the garage. There was a lone desk. There was a person sitting at the desk talking on the phone.

Another person came to the desk to greet me and then at that time point I asked the person if -- if they ever had any photographers come to the salvage yard to take pictures of vehicles.

And he said he didn't know. And then I came back and I mentioned that my cousin was missing. She was a photographer. And that was the reason for

- 1 my visit.
- Q. All right. Let me ask you, Mr. Beach, do you know the defendant, Steven Avery, the gentleman
- 4 seated in the courtroom today?
- 6 Q. When you got to the salvage yard on the 5th of --

At the time I did not; today I do.

- 7 excuse me -- on the 4th of November, that Friday;
- 8 was Steven Avery one of the people that you
- 9 talked to at the office or in what you call the
- 10 garage?

5

A.

- 11 A. Yes, he was the second person.
- 12 Q. Did you specifically ask Mr. Avery whether or not
- 13 your cousin, Teresa, had been to the salvage
- 14 yard?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What did Mr. Avery tell you?
- 17 A. He said that she was there; roughly about 2:00 in
- 18 the afternoon.
- 19 Q. All right. Just, back up just a second.
- 20 Mr. Avery himself told you that Teresa was there
- 21 that day or the day that she had come to take
- 22 pictures?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. At 2:00 in the afternoon, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 This would have been three days after her 2 appearance there; is that right? 3 Yes, this was a Friday. 4 Q. Okay. Mr. Avery give you any more details about 5 what Teresa had done while at the property? 6 A. He told me that she was there, there was a 7 vehicle behind the office garage and she was 8 taken to the vehicle to be photographed. That 9 was about -- That was her purpose for being 10 there. 11 Let me ask you, Mr. Beach, upon your stopping at 12 this Auto Trader or -- excuse me -- at the Avery 13 salvage lot, did you provide any information or 14 any literature to the -- either Mr. Avery himself 15 or to the Avery salvage business? 16 A. No, I did not. 17 0. How long was it that you discussed your cousin 18 with Mr. Avery? 19 A. Five minutes. 20 0. Finally, Mr. Beach, did Mr. Avery know who you 21 were talking about; in other words, did he 22 indicate whether or not this woman had been there 23 before? Yes, I described her build, her -- what she 24

looked like, what she drove. And he confirmed

1	W	all that. And he confirmed that she was there to
2		take photographs.
3	Q.	Had she been there before?
4	A.	Had she been there before?
5	Q.	Did he tell you?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	What did he say, if you can remember?
8	A.	In my line of questioning about my cousin, she
9	1	was missing, he said that, yes, Teresa Halbach
10		came there on a regular basis.
11	Q.	So that the jury is clear, Mr. Beach, after that
12		five minute that brief contact with Mr. Avery;
13		did you return to the Avery salvage property or
14		did you have any other conversation with
15		Mr. Avery?
16	A.	No.
17		ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all I have of this
18		witness, then, Judge.
19		THE COURT: Mr. Buting.
20		ATTORNEY BUTING: Thank you, Judge.
21		CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY A	ATTORNEY BUTING:
23	Q.	Now, Mr. Beach, do you know what time it was that
24		you came to see Mr. Avery at the Avery Salvage
25		Yard?

- 1 A. About 4:00.
- 2 Q. On Friday afternoon?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And by that time, of course, there had been reports about your sister in the media, right -- I'm sorry, your cousin, with the media about her
- 7 being missing and all of that?
- 8 A. I do not know; I did not hear that.
- 9 Q. So you didn't see any of the news report about your cousin?
- 11 A. Correct.

21

22

- 12 Q. Okay. So how was it that you ended up at the
 13 Avery salvage lot?
- A. Friday morning, I received a phone call from my
 parents. They told me about my cousin, Teresa,
 was missing. I -- Later that afternoon, I came
 up, I met up with my sister. We then got
 information from the Halbachs. After that we
 just drove around and we started from Mishicot
 and we worked our way north.
 - Q. Okay. My question, I guess is, did somebody give you information about what her appointments were that day?
- A. The Halbachs told me the general area she had work in, but they did not give me any idea of

1 where her stops were. 2 Q. So no one told you that she had an appointment on 3 Monday, the 31st, at the Avery salvage lot --4 yard? 5 A. Correct. 6 0. You just stumbled on that? 7 Yeah, by incident. It was incidental. A. 8 Okay. And when you got there, Steven Avery, the Q. 9 person sitting to my left, who you now know, came 10 up and seemed concerned about what you were 11 asking about, right? 12 A. Yes. 13 0. Seemed calm? 14 A. Correct. 15 0. Did not appear to be holding anything back? 16 A. No. 17 0. Correct? 18 A. Correct. 19 In fact, I think you described him as being very 0. 20 forthright, didn't you? 21 A. Correct. 22 Expressing genuine concern about, you know, what Q. 23 happened to your cousin? 24 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Objection, Judge, calls for speculation, how genuine it may be. 25 217

1		THE COURT: Well, he can testify as to his
2		impression.
3	1	THE WITNESS: He said that he was
4		concerned.
5	Q.	(By Attorney Buting) ~ Okay. And you accepted
6		that?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	And he told you You described his vehicle
9		I'm sorry, you described her vehicle, the RAV4?
10	A.	Yes.
11	Q.	And he said, yes, I do recall, she was driving
12		that. And she came he actually said she came
13		some time mid-afternoon, didn't he?
14	A.	Yes, he said that she was at his garage, salvage
15		yard, around 2:00.
16	Q.	But he actually he qualified that by saying
17		approximately mid-afternoon?
18	A.	Correct.
19	Q.	Okay. Wasn't exact on the time?
20	A.	Correct.
21	Q.	And he said that she did take photo of the
22		vehicle, right?
23	A.	Correct.
24	Q.	And that he did not know her next stop, right?
25	A.	Yes.
		21.8

1	Q.	And he told you that when the RAV4 pulled out of
2		the driveway, that it went to the left from the
3		Avery property?
4	A.	Correct.
5		ATTORNEY BUTING: All right. I have no
6		further questions.
7		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
8		THE COURT: Anything else? Very well, you
9		are excused.
10		Members of the jury, that's going to
11		conclude the court proceedings for today. I will
12		remind you again not to discuss this case with
13		anyone, before we resume tomorrow. And we'll see
14		you tomorrow morning.
15		(Jury not present.)
16		THE COURT: Counsel, I would just ask that
17		tomorrow morning the attorneys meet in chambers at
18		8:20 before the day begins, just to let me know
19		what's coming.
20		ATTORNEY BUTING: What time did you say the
21		jury is coming, 8:45?
22		THE COURT: Okay. Meet at 8:30. We'll
23		find out from experience what time they normally get
24		here. I believe you are right, meet at 8:30.
25		ATTORNEY FALLON: Excuse me, Judge, did you

want to take up that other matter today or tomorrow morning? THE COURT: I have a number of other matters listed, I'm not sure which one you want, but we'll discuss that tomorrow morning. ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. (Proceedings concluded.)

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)ss 2 COUNTY OF MANITOWOC 3 I, Diane Tesheneck, Official Court 4 Reporter for Circuit Court Branch 1 and the State 5 of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that I reported 6 7 the foregoing matter and that the foregoing 8 transcript has been carefully prepared by me with my computerized stenographic notes as taken by me 9 in machine shorthand, and by computer-assisted 10 transcription thereafter transcribed, and that it 11 is a true and correct transcript of the 12 13 proceedings had in said matter to the best of my 14 knowledge and ability. Dated this 5th day of October, 2007. 15 16 17 18 Diane Tesheneck, 19 Official Court Reporter 20 21 22 23 24 25